DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 689 CE 036 038

AUTHOR	Gottlieb, David; Driscoll, Eleanor
TITLE	Entering the World of Work: Young Americans and Their Employers. Final Data Base Report No. 4. Technical Report No. 26.
INSTITUTION	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY	Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Youth Programs.
PUB DATE	Nov 82
CONTRACT	99-9-257-33-48
NOTE	185p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; Adults; Basic Skills; Demonstration Programs; *Disadvantaged Youth; Education Work Relationship; Employee Attitudes; *Employer Attitudes; *Employment Programs; Employment Qualifications; *Entry Workers; Federal Programs; Job Training; *Work Attitudes; *Youth Employment
IDENTIFIERS	Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted to determine the attitudes, perceptions, and experiences of employers of low income youth--specifically of youth between the ages of 16 and 21 who had participated in federally funded programs under the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA). Data were obtained in 1981 from the employers of 1,496 disadvantaged youth, most of whom had participated in various career development programs identified by the project staff. The largest type of employer was in the service and retail trades, while public agencies made up the next largest group. The study found that employers insisted upon entrance criteria, such as cognitive skills and personal appearance, but did not measure these skills. At the same time, it was found that most of the low-paying, low-skilled jobs performed by youth did not require the skills that employers expected. Employers were in agreement about areas in which youth needed work preparation. Cited most frequently was an improvement in work-related attitudes and knowledge of proper behavior on the job. These items were cited much more frequently than were needs for improvement in job skills or technical education. Employers also felt that youth lacked an appropriate work ethic and that they were in need of basic educational skills. Young Employees also had higher job turnover and more lateness and absenteeism than older employees. Although employers cited these items as problems, they were not unsympathetic to the fact that the routine, low-level work performed by these youth contributed to the turnover. The employers thought job training should have been provided by public agencies and that there should not have been a different minimum wage for youth. (KC)

ED230689

ENTERING THE WORLD OF WORK:

YOUNG AMERICANS AND THEIR EMPLOYERS

David Gottlieb
The University of Houston

Eleanor Driscoll
Educational Testing Service

Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey 08541

Final Data Base Report No. 4
Technical Report No. 26
November, 1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CE036038

Data for this research was obtained through a contract from the U.S. Department of Labor (E.T.A.-Youth Administration; contract number 99-9-257-33-48).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A national survey of this magnitude calls upon the energies, talents, and commitment of many people. Certainly we are grateful for the efforts of project interviewers and those employers who shared their opinions with us.

Several of the professional staff at The Educational Testing Service were more than generous with their assistance. Particularly, we are very much indebted to Mr. Gary Driscoll, Senior Programming Analyst, who converted a mass of raw data into a coherent and operational format. Ms. Roberta G. Kline, Senior Research Assistant, with the assistance of Ms. Michaele Mikovsky, also a Senior Research Assistant, undertook the major task of the content analysis of respondent comments. Their collective effort, we believe, greatly enhanced our understanding of the less apparent attitudes, perceptions, and values of employer respondents.

Ms. Pearl Robb, of the University of Houston, performed again in a most remarkable manner as the manuscript organizer, typist, and publication overseer.

Mr. Joseph Seiler of the U.S. Department of Labor was perceptive enough to see the importance of a study of employers. His commitment to, and concern for poor youth negates the popular view of the government bureaucrat as being indifferent and obtuse.

Finally, we wish to acknowledge the many good deeds of our friend and colleague, Jules Goodison.

David Gottlieb
Eleanor Driscoll

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Introduction		1
Chapter I:	Sampling and Methodology	5
Chapter II:	Youth Program Participants and Controls: Where They Work	19
Chapter III:	Entering the Job Market: Barriers to Employment	46
Chapter IV:	Employer Experiences With and Assessment of Youth Employees	61
Chapter V:	Employment and Generational Differences	78
Chapter VI:	Issues and Policies of Youth Employment	127
Chapter VII:	Summary and Conclusions	170

INTRODUCTION

Much of course has been written about youthful employment and unemployment. A variety of inquiries have examined various phases of the processes by which young people search out and secure employment.[1] Other investigators have attempted to identify relationships between work histories and variables such as age, sex, race-ethnicity, and socio-economic status.[2] Still others have focused upon the employability impact of educational achievement, secondary school curriculum, or in school behavior.[3] Studies have dealt with such diverse topics as youthful unemployment and drug use, crime, leisure time utilization, and entrance into the armed forces.[4] More recently, attempts have been made to study both short and long term benefits of participation in federally funded youth employment training programs.[5] For the most part, the major motivation for these studies has been a desire to enhance the employment opportunities of low income, disadvantaged youth. Since employment is at least a two sided coin involving employee and employer, it could reasonably be assumed that both sides--employee and employer--would be appropriate subject for inquiry. Surprisingly enough, such is not the case. In the vast majority of studies, irregardless of methodology or focus, the data base is youth themselves. The instances where the source of data is employers are few indeed.[6] Hence, in seeking to explain observed variations in the work related behavior of youth, researchers frequently are forced to make assumptions about those who employ youth. For example, more than a few investigators have suggested that abolition of the minimum wage would lead to an increase in youth employment, particularly the employment of unskilled, under-educated youth.[7] At the same time, the few studies which have raised this issue with employers suggest quite the contrary; that a lowering of the minimum wage would not be the stimulus for a substantial increase in youth employment.[8] Similarly, assumptions are made that with an improvement in reading, math, or presentation of self, a youth's probability for job entry will be significantly enhanced. Whether or not this would be the case in most or even a few work settings has not really been determined.

How different employers perceive different youth; the criteria and processes they utilize for selection or rejection of youthful applicants; how they compare youthful employees to older workers; what they expect of youthful employees; and what they see as their responsibilities or obligations for assisting youth in the school to work transition are questions which have yet to be answered.

The reader might have already anticipated the primary purpose of this particular study is to attempt to answer certain of these employer related questions. It is important at this time to provide the reader with some understanding of the history and context of this study.

Originally, our purpose was to examine differences in the job placements of 697 low income youth; 510 of whom had participated in various Youth Career Development (YCD) School-to-Work Transition programs during the 1979-1980 academic year, and 187 youth who served as a control group. The results of that study are found in a report submitted to D.O.L. ("The School-to-Work Transition: Low Income Youth and Their Employers," David Gottlieb and Eleanor Driscoll, December 1981: E.T.A. - Youth Administration contract number 99-9-257-33-48.) Data were collected from a total of 697 employers. How respondents were selected and the data collection process are discussed in the first chapter of that report.

In general, the findings of that study yielded two conclusions: 1) For the most part, differences between where Y.C.D. participants and controls obtained employment were minimal, and 2) Work places where this sample of youth obtained employment were not really different from where the majority of American youth, disadvantaged or advantaged, obtained entry level part-time or full-time work.

In order to determine whether or not the kinds of employment training programs in which youth participated might play some part in where they find employment, a second study, also funded by D.O.L., was undertaken. In this case the idea was to collect data from those employers who were reported to have hired participants from other than Y.C.D. School-to-Work Transition programs. The sampling and methodology utilized in this second phase of the inquiry are described in Chapter 1 of this report.

Since preliminary analysis of this second set of interviews showed little variation from the earlier Y.C.D. study, a decision was made to combine both sets of data into a single analysis and report. Hence, this report is based upon interviews obtained from a total of 1,496 employer respondents--1,136 who represent firms or agencies which were identified as having employed C.E.T.A. eligible program participants.

The reader should keep in mind that the units of analysis for this study are employing organizations and not youth. Hence, we deal here with the practices, procedures, policies, attitudes, and expectations of those organizations which play a very significant part in absorbing entry level youth into the labor market.

David Gottlieb
The University of Houston

Eleanor Driscoll
The Educational Testing Service

August , 1982

FOOTNOTES

[1] See for example, "Job Search Activities of Youth," M.E. Borus, C. Kim, and R. Santos in Pathways to the Future, Volume 1. A report of the National Longitudinal Surveys on Youth Labor Market Experience, 1979. Edited by Michael E. Borus, The Ohio State University Center for Human Resource Research.

[2] A fairly good synthesis of this literature is found in: "Labor Market Problems of Teen Agers Result Largely from Doing Poorly in School." A report by the U.S. General Accounting Office, United States General Accounting Office, March 29, 1982, Washington, D.C.
M.D. Ornstein, Entry Into the American Labor Force, New York, Academic Press, 1976.

[3] G.A.O. (noted in Footnote 2); and S. Wolfbein, Education and Training for Full Employment, New York, Columbia University Press, 1967; E. Ginzberg, The Manpower Connection: Education and Work, Cambridge, MA. the Harvard University Press, 1975; S.E. Berryman, "Youth Unemployment and Career Education: Reasonable Expectations." Public Policy, 1978, 26, pp. 29-69; J.T. Grasso and J.R. Shea, Vocational Education and Training: Impact on Youth, Berkeley, CA. The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1979.

[4] I. Ehrlich, "Participation in Illegitimate Activities: A Theoretical and Empirical Investigation," Journal of Political Economy, May/June 1973, 81 (3) pp. 521-565; Glueck and Glueck, Of Delinquency and Crime, Sringfield, Ill. Charles C. Thomas, 1974; Delinquency in American Society, Law Enforcement Assistance Agency, Institute of Juvenile Research, Chicago, Ill. 1978; A.V. Adams and G.L. Mangum, The Lingering Crisis of Youth Unemployment, Kalmazoo, Mich. The Upjohn Institute, 1978.

[5] R. Taggart, A Fisherman's Guide: An Assessment of Training and Remediation Strategies, Kalmazoo, Mich. The W.E. Upjohn Institute, 1981. An excellent source of program evaluations is the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, New Jersey. E.T.S. has primary responsibility for analysis of data based upon a national sample of American youth who had participated in a wide range of federally funded youth employment programs.

[6] An exception would be a study of a sample of New York City employers described in the report, Working Youth, New York. Interface, 1981.

[7] Training and Jobs for the Urban Poor, Committee for Economic Development, New York, 1970.

[8] D. Gottlieb and E. Driscoll, The School to Work Transition: Low Income Youth and Their Employers, U.S. Department of Labor, December, 1981.

CHAPTER I: SAMPLING AND METHODOLOGY

This study represents the compilation of data obtained from 697 employer interviews conducted during the spring (Phase I) and 799 conducted during the fall of 1981 (Phase II).[1] The sample consisted of the employers of 1,496 disadvantaged (CETA eligible) youth, 1,136 of whom had participated in the various career development programs listed in Tables 1 and 2 of this chapter. Program participants had enrolled in these programs on a voluntary basis either as high school students (36%), graduates (21%), or dropouts (43%). Youth who were in the Phase I sample took part in the programs while in-school, and those in the Phase II sample were primarily enrolled in out-of-school programs, serving youth who were no longer enrolled in school. At the time these data were collected, enrollees had completed program participation and most, who had been enrolled in high school, had earned their high school diplomas. The employers selected for this study represented organizations, agencies, corporations, and institutions which had employed these youth for either full- or part-time jobs.

The remainder of the sample is composed of employers of 360 youth who had served as part of control groups in the cities where the youth programs were located. The control group youth were selected by the youth program staff to match participants in sex, grade level, and socio-economic background.

Because complete records (demographic profiles) were not available for 167 youth, the analyses in this report are based on a final sample of 1,329; 1,014 program participants and 315 control group youth. In total then, about three fourths of the final sample is composed of employers of program youth and another fourth were employers of youth who had not participated in any career development programs.

---

[1] Analysis of Phase I of this study are provided in a report entitled, The School to Work Transition: Low Income Youth and Their Employers, David Gottlieb and Eleanor Driscoll, December, 1981.

The youth ranged in age between 18 and 24 when their employers were contacted for this study and the majority of them were under 21 years old. The sample had a fairly equal representation of sexes; 47% male and 53% female. Most of the youth were Black (52%) and the remainder were White (29%), Hispanic (18%), and 1% were American Indian/Alaskan Native or Asian/Pacific Islander. At the time that they entered the various youth programs, the economic status of nearly all of the sample was under 85% LLSIL; that is, the youth was a member of a family which has an annual income which, based upon family size and geographical location, is below 85% of the lower living standard income level.*

Employer interviews were conducted in each of the 50 cities listed in Table 3. The number of interviews conducted in each of these cities was large enough so that in the final sample there was a geographic representation of youth from each of four regions of the United States: 474 (36%) from the Northeast, 456 (34%) from the Sunbelt, 222 (17%) from the Midwest, and 177 (13%) from the West.

Program Descriptions

The Youth Career Development Program

Seven organizations or delivery agents provided the YCD career development services: The National Urban League, The U.S. Employment Service, the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, SER Jobs for Progress, the National Council of Negro Women, the National Council of La Raza, and the Recruitment and Training Program.

---

*The Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Department of Labor issues an updated estimate of a lower budget for a hypothetical family of four each year. These estimates are used in determining CETA eligibility.

The YCD curriculum covered the following areas: 1) familiarization with occupation and career information resources, 2) career exposure and exploration, 3) job search skills development, 4) methods of realistic occupational goal setting and planning, 5) self awareness and motivational training, 6) job development and referral, and 7) counseling for vocational and personal guidance.

Each of the seven delivery agents were responsible for the operation of a set of demonstration projects that shared the above core curriculum components but each organization presented a unique variation of the YCD School-to-Work program. For example, The Women's Bureau project focused on expanding young women's awareness of nontraditional career choices. The National Council of Negro Women project was designed to provide career development services to both male and female minority students. The primary goal of the SER demonstration project was to serve the needs of Hispanic-American youth by assisting them in their transition from high school to permanent, non-subsidized, full-time employment. Placing economically disadvantaged Hispanic-American youth in non-subsidized employment was also the goal of the project managed by the National Council of La Raza.

The various projects provided different concentrations of classroom vocational training, either paid or unpaid job shadowing, internships, and job placements. Basic skills and English as a second language were necessary components of the classroom training of some of the projects. No stipend was provided to program participants, but many did receive some academic credit.

Program staff developed and maintained linkages with local school districts, private and public employers, C.E.T.A. Prime Sponsors, community-based service organizations, and other agencies in order to support and coordinate the project.

The seven YCD projects varied in terms of their linkage and coordinative arrangements at both the national and local levels.

The non-YCD projects were:

Job Search Assistance - Job Factory

The purpose of this program was to determine whether direct instruction in job acquisition skills eases the transition of disadvantaged youth into the labor market. Job search assistance programs were of relatively short duration, with intensive interventions including formal instruction in job search behavior with experience and supervision in actually looking for work. The average participant was 18 years of age and could be a dropout, high school student or graduate. Data for this program was collected by staff at the Brandeis University Center for Public Service.

Private Sector Initiatives

Project 70,001 - This was a non-stipend, pre-employment training program that prepares youth for unsubsidized jobs in the private sector. The emphasis was on job development rather than vocational education. Program components included counseling services, GED preparation, supportive peer group through 70,001 Career Association (SEVCA), and job placement. Small to medium sized companies, particularly retailers, provided employment opportunities.

Jobs for Youth - This was a non-stipend, pre-employment youth service program conducted by non-profit Jobs for Youth agencies. JFY provided job readiness counseling, multiple private sector job placements, on-going progress monitoring, and work related educational support. Small to medium sized employers were assigned a JFY service representative responsible for ensuring that the employer's needs were met. Participants were 16-21 year old out-of-school youth. Staff at the Corporation for Public Private Ventures in Philadelphia and Management Sciences Group, Inc. in New York collected the data for the Private Sector Initiatives projects.

Public vs. Private Sector Jobs Demonstration

The purpose of this project was to test the widespread assumption that youth would gain more from private rather than public sector employment. The project examined the relative benefits of serving youth through subsidized full-time jobs (100% of the minimum wage) in both the private and public sectors. It involved a short one week orientation followed by job placement. Recipients of project services were 16-21 year old out-of-school youth who were randomly assigned to public and private sector jobs. (The private sector included both profit and nonprofit employers.) Data collection for this project was completed by staff at the St. Louis University Center for Urban Programs.

Ventures in Community Improvement

This program was designed to be a model community improvement program dependent upon strong ties among organizations and officials in the areas of housing, manpower, education, labor and local government. Youth were placed under the supervision of skilled journeymen in the building and related trades and assigned to projects involving emergency home repair, home weatherization, and public facility renovation. The goal was to equip youth with skills and disciplines needed to become apprentices in the building trades, or to enable them to obtain jobs involving the physical enhancement of their communities. The program served 16-19 year old out-of-school youth. The data collection was completed by Public Private Ventures in Philadelphia and Management Sciences Group, Inc. in New York.

Vocational Exploration Demonstration

This vocational exploration program was aimed at examining relationships in a variety of vocational exploration program (VEP) models among the people served, program activities and services, impacts and environmental factors. It also was planned to investigate the effects of VEP programs upon the attitudes and institutional behaviors of business and organized labor. The program was conducted by Community Based Organizations (CBOs), prime sponsors, organized labor, and vocational schools. Youth had minimal classroom instuction with either on-site placement with employers, vocational laboratories in vo-tech schools or added classroom experience including field work (e.g., interviewing with employers). The program served both in-school youth and high school graduates whose mean age was 17.5 years. Responsibility for data collection was with the St. Louis University Center for Urban Programs.

Data Collection

Instruments used in the data collection included a Follow-up Survey, an Employer Interview, and an Individual Participant Profile (IPP). The Follow-up Survey is a 59-item questionnaire that was administered approximately eight months after the participants left the program. The questionnaire was to be administered via an individual interview between the youth and the program staff member. Items in the follow-up survey deal with, among others, the youth's post-training experiences in areas of employment and education, social adjustments, and future plans. The items dealing with post-program employment experiences are discussed in this report. One of the items seeks to identify location of most recent employment and whether that employment was full or part-time. That information was used in order to identify employer organizations and the respondents who provided information for this study.

The Employer Interview is a 50-item questionnaire organized into three parts: a) General Characteristics of the Organization, b) The Organization's Employment and Training Practices, and c) The Organization's Experience with Youth Employees. The questionnaire elicits factual information about the organization; its policies and employees; as well as attitudinal information regarding the employer's experience with and assessment of young workers. The questionnaire does not seek information on individual youth, but rather on youth in general; that is, young people between the ages of 16 and 21 years.

The Individual Participant Profile consists of a 49-item sheet on which program staff were to record information dealing with a variety of the youth background characteristics. The items in the first half of the IPP are mostly near demographic and cover such information as the individual's sex, age, race, marital status, and so forth. This information was collected in order to describe the youth sample and to provide controlling variables in the data analyses.

Project coordinators in each of the program sites were responsible for coordinating all of the data collection for the YCD-Phase I portion of the study. Either local project staff or representatives from the organization's national office recruited interviewers. In some cases, local project staff conducted the employer interviews. For Phase II of the study, the research agencies for each of the projects were responsible for conducting employer interviews.

The Employer Interview was to be conducted with employers of individuals who had participated in programs, and employers of individuals who served as members of control and comparison groups. Interviewers sought out the youth's most recent full- or part-time employer as identified in the eight month Follow-up Survey. It was suggested that someone who was knowledgeable about the organization's staff and hiring practices be contacted for the interview. For small organizations, the interviewee was often the owner or manager. For large organizations, it was often necessary for the interviewer to seek out both personnel and line managers in order to complete the entire questionnaire.

Interviewers were asked to read the introduction on the cover sheet of the Employer Interview to the employer and to make it clear that the interview was being conducted by the University of Houston for research purposes. Though the interviewers assured confidentiality and explained that the information collected would be used only for research purposes, some employers did have reservations about responding to some questions in the survey instrument. Several interviewers felt that some employers were apprehensive about expressing their personal opinions in response to certain questions. Still in the great majority of cases, all information sought in the instrument was provided by the employer-respondent.

Interviewers were instructed to then read aloud each of the questions in the survey and enter the responses as the employer answered the question. The approach was one of working with the respondent to obtain information by reading and explaining the material in a relatively informal manner. Instructions referring to specific items were provided. For some questions, it was recommended that the employer be "probed" in order to obtain more detailed information and to tap reasons for offered responses. Interviewers were encouraged to record accurately all responses, most particularly complete responses to all of the open-ended questions.

Once the Employer interview was completed, it was matched with the I.P.P. and eight month Follow-up data from which the employing organization had been identified. Hence, it is possible to examine what kinds of youth went into what types of employment settings.

If several youth happened to be employed at the same place, only one interview with that employer was accepted. No employer information was sought for youth in the military. Each project site was expected to produce a certain number of Employer Interviews, based largely on the number of youth that they were able to contact from a previous three month Follow-up Survey. However, most project coordinators fell short of their allocations for the following reasons: 1) Several youth in the sample from a given city had the same employer; 2) Some of the youth were in the military at the Eight Month Follow-up point; 3) Some youth were unemployed either because they were in school or out of the labor force; and 4) Some employers who were contacted refused to be interviewed.

Employers who were interviewed were representatives of eight types of organizations: (1) Health, Education, Welfare Agencies, Governmental Services [HEWG], (2) Wholesale-Retail Trade [WRT], (3) Services and Select Retail Trade [SSRT], (4) Manufacturing [MANU], (5) Financial, Insurance, and Select Business Services [FINS], (6) Transportation, Communications, Utilities [TCU], (7) Construction [CONS], (8) Farming, Fisheries, Forestry [FFF].

TABLE 1

PART I EMPLOYER INTERVIEW SAMPLE
FROM YOUTH CAREER DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL-TO-WORK TRANSITION PROJECTS

Projects	Participants	Controls	Total
National Urban League			
Englewood, NJ	1	0	1
Cambridge, MA	15	11	26
New Orleans, LA	23	3	26
St. Louis, MO	4	4	8
San Diego, CA	24	7	31
Winston-Salem, NC	37	8	45
Subtotal	104	33	137
U.S. Employment Service			
Jersey City, NJ	6	5	11
Rome, GA	21	4	25
Kansas City, MO	25	14	39
Phoenix, AZ	8	9	17
Yakima, WA	20	0	20
Subtotal	80	32	112
Women's Bureau			
Atlanta, GA	13	15	28
Dallas, TX	16	3	19
Portland, OR	21	6	27
Mason City, IA	15	9	24
Philadelphia, PA	8	0	8
Subtotal	73	33	106
SER			
Fall River, MA	16	0	16
Miami, FL	18	14	32
Ft. Worth, TX	25	8	33
Sacramento, CA	17	8	25
Subtotal	76	30	106
National Council of Negro Women			
Bronx, NY	37	5	42
Charleston, SC	14	6	20
San Bernadino, CA	26	8	34
Subtotal	77	19	96
La Raza			
Denver, CO	23	3	26
Houston, TX	39	9	48
Subtotal	62	12	74
Recruitment & Training Program			
Mount Vernon, NY	10	0	10
Nashville, TN	15	12	27
Evansville, IN	3	5	8
Greensboro, NC	7	6	13
Buffalo, NY	3	5	8
Subtotal	38	28	66
	====	====	====
GRAND TOTAL	510	187	697

TABLE 2

PART II EMPLOYER INTERVIEW SAMPLE FROM OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRAMS

NAME OF PROJECT	SITE#	LOCATION	PARTICIPANTS	CONTROLS	TOTAL
Public vs. Private	06-01	Phila., PA	36	0	36
	06-02	Portland, OR	11	0	11
	06-03	St. Louis, MO	71	0	71
	06-04	New York, NY	60	0	60
	06-05	Detroit Lakes, MN	54	0	54
Subtotal			232	0	232
Job Factory	13-01	Cambridge, MA	5	10	15
	13-02	Cambridge, MA	2	6	8
	13-03	Cambridge, MA	2	3	5
Subtotal			9	19	28
Vocational Exploration Demonstration	18-02	Allentown, PA	14	0	14
	18-03	Atlanta, GA	12	0	12
	18-04	Colorado Springs, CO	8	0	8
	18-05	Duluth, MN	10	0	10
	18-06	Haverhill, MA	13	0	13
	18-07	Helena, MT	12	0	12
	18-09	Lansing, MI	8	0	8
	18-10	Memphis, TN	10	0	10
	18-11	New Orleans, LA	14	0	14
	18-14	Pittsburgh, PA	5	0	5
	18-15	San Francisco, CA	17	0	17
	18-16	Tacoma, WA	17	0	17
Subtotal			140	0	140

TABLE 2 (continued)

NAME OF PROJECT	SITE #	LOCATION	PARTICIPANTS	CONTROLS	TOTAL
Private Sector Initiatives Demonstration	34-15	Jobs for Youth Boston, MA	47	51	98
	34-16	70,001 Atlanta, GA	19	20	39
	34-17	70,001 Boston, MA	9	11	20
	34-18	70,001 Richmond, VA	8	5	13
	34-19	70,001 San Antonio, TX	17	15	32
	34-20	70,001 Tulsa, OK	28	30	58
Subtotal			128	132	260
Ventures in Community Improvement	41-15	Atlanta, GA	0	6	6
	41-16	Broward, FL	8	0	8
	41-18	Milwaukee, WI	13	2	15
	41-19	Newark, NJ	21	6	27
	41-20	New Haven, CT	30	0	30
	41-21	Philadelphia, PA	27	8	35
	41-22	S. Bronx, NY	18	0	18
Subtotal			117	22	139
			=====	=====	=====
GRAND TOTAL			626	173	799

TABLE 3

CITIES WHERE EMPLOYER INTERVIEWS WERE CONDUCTED

	PARTICIPANTS	CONTROLS	TOTAL
Phoenix, AZ	8	9	17
Sacramento, CA	17	8	25
San Bernadino, CA	26	8	34
San Diego, CA	24	7	31
San Francisco, CA	17	0	17
Colorado Springs, CO	8	0	8
Denver, CO	23	3	26
New Haven, CT	30	0	30
Broward, FL	8	0	8
Miami, FL	18	14	32
Atlanta, GA	44	41	85
Rome, GA	21	4	25
Mason City, IA	15	9	24
Evansville, IN	3	5	8
New Orleans, LA	37	3	40
Boston, MA	56	62	118
Cambridge, MA	24	30	54
Fall River, MA	16	0	16
Haverhill, MA	13	0	13
Lansing, MI	8	0	8
Detroit Lakes, MI	54	0	54
Duluth, MN	10	0	10
Kansas City, MO	25	14	39
St. Louis, MO	75	4	79
Helena, MT	12	0	12
Greensboro, NC	7	6	13
Winston-Salem, NC	37	8	45
Englewood, NJ	1	0	1
Jersey City, NJ	6	5	11
Newark, NJ	21	6	27
Bronx, NY	55	5	60
Buffalo, NY	3	5	8
Mount Vernon, NY	10	0	10
New York, NY	60	0	60

TABLE 3 (continued)

	PARTICIPANTS	CONTROLS	TOTAL
Tulsa, OK	28	30	58
Portland, OR	32	6	38
Allentown, PA	14	0	14
Philadelphia, PA	71	8	79
Pittsburgh, PA	5	0	5
Charleston, SC	14	6	20
Memphis, TN	10	0	10
Nashville, TN	15	12	27
Dallas, TX	16	3	19
Ft. Worth, TX	25	8	33
Houston, TX	39	9	48
San Antonio, TX	17	15	32
Richmond, VA	8	5	13
Tacoma, WA	17	0	17
Yakima, WA	20	0	20
Milwaukee, WI	13	2	15
GRAND TOTAL	1136	360	1496

CHAPTER II: YOUTH PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS AND CONTROLS: WHERE THEY WORK

Eight industrial classification categories are utilized in this research in order to differentiate between the many organizations which employ youth.

The title of each of the eight is presented with examples of the kinds of work places found in each category, as well as the number of employer respondents in each category.

Table II - 1

Organizational - Industrial Classification

I. Service and Select Retail Trade (SSRT) N=388

Service Stations
Restaurants
Repair Services

II. Health, Education, Governmental Service, Welfare Agencies (HEWG) N=352

Legal or governmental agencies
Hospitals
Schools
Laboratories

III. Wholesale-Retail Trade (WRT) N=239

Food Stores
General Merchandise Stores

IV. Manufacturing (MANU) N=173

Machinery
Chemicals
Electrical Equipment/Supplies

V. Financial, Insurance, Select Business Services (FINS) N=68

Computing Services
Banks
Accounting Firms

VI. Construction (CONS) N=52

Carpentry
Plumbing
Painting-Plastering

VII. Transportation, Communications, Utilities (TCU) N=44

Trucking, Shipping Firms
Communications
Telephone, Electric Services

VIII. Farming, Fisheries, Forestry (FFF) N=13

Landscaping
Farms

There are few, if any, real differences between the place of employment of program participants and control group members.

Table II-2 illustrates the percentage distribution of type of employing organization for both groups.

Table II-2

Employing Organizations: Participants/Controls

	SSRT	HEWG	WRT	MANU	FINS	CONS	TCU	FFF	N
Participants	29	27	17	13	5	4	3	1	1014
Controls	29	26	20	12	6	4	3	1	315
P>C	0	1	-3	1	-1	0	0	0	
N	(338)	(352)	(239)	(173)	(68)	(52)	(44)	(13)	1329

Table I indicates that the largest proportion of participant youth are employed in the SSRT and HEWG areas, while control group youth tend to be more evenly distributed among three work settings: SSRT, HEWG, and WRT.

Three categories of organizations employ over one-third of the youth from the sample: restaurants (13%), professional, technical, and managerial offices (11%), and sales organizations (10%).

Some thirteen percent (13%) of the youth are working at public organizations, mostly in the HEWG category. A fifth of these public organizations are federal agencies; twenty seven percent (27%) state; eleven percent (11%) county; and the remainder (43%) city.

Thirteen percent (13%) of the private organizations are international, in scope, twenty three percent (23%) are national, and sixty five percent (65%) local. Most (83%) of the organizations are profit making and a little more than a third (36%) are family owned and operated.

Table II-3

Program and Place of Employment - Percent

	HEWG	MANU	WRT	TCU	SSRT	FINS	FFF	CONS	N
U.S. Employment Service	28	12	19	2	28	6	2	2	(80)
National Urban League	27	10	33	5	13	6	0	6	(63)
Womens Bureau	32	11	19	3	28	6	0	1	(97)
National Council of Negro Women	41	5	18	1	28	6	0	1	(87)
Recruitment Training Program	30	13	28	3	23	3	0	0	(61)
SER	25	18	28	1	18	10	0	0	(83)
La Raza	18	26	21	3	15	8	3	5	(61)
Public vs. Private Ventures	28	10	15	5	35	6	1	0	(231)
Job Factory	32	18	21	0	14	14	0	0	(28)
Vocational Exploration Program	21	20	15	2	34	4	1	4	(140)
Private Sector Initiatives	25	12	12	2	40	4	1	5	(260)
Ventures in Community Improvement	20	12	17	8	25	1	1	15	(138)
							TOTAL		1329

Table II-4

Program and Place of Employment - Percent

	Private	Public
U.S. Employment Service	87	13
National Urban League	78	22
Womens Bureau	79	21
National Council of Negro Women	82	18
Recruitment Training Program	78	22
SER	83	17
La Raza	86	14
Public vs. Private Ventures	91	9
Job Factory	96	4
Vocational Exploration Program	90	10
Private Sector Initiatives	91	9
Ventures in Community Improvement	90	10

The type of organizations where participant and control group youth are employed is shown by program operator in Table II-3. The percentages of youth employed in each of the eight organizations does vary among the various programs. Although most youth were employed in SSRT and HEWG organizations, there were some exceptions. The National Urban League and SER, assuming a positive relationship between employer interviews and youth placements, were most heavily concentrated in Wholesale and Retail Trades. La Raza conducted most of its interviews with MANU employers. Regardless of program variations, it is clear from Table II-4 that the majority of youth were employed in the private sector which accounts for three fourths of all employer interviews.

Although seventy percent (70%) of the youth in this sample were from Northeastern and Sunbelt states, each area of the country was geographically represented. It is apparent from the table below (Table II-5) that differences in type of employment across sections of the country were not great, though a few are worth mentioning. The Midwest and West have the largest percentages of employment in SSRT and the Northeast has the smallest percentage in this category and the largest in HEWG. It would appear then, that even though regions of the country may differ significantly in economic base and industrial composition--entry level youth are fairly monolithic in the places they work and the jobs they hold.

Table II-5

Geographical Location and Place of Employment - Percent

	HEWG	MANU	WRT	TCU	SSRT	FINS	FFF	CONS	N
Northeast	31	14	15	4	22	7	1	6	(474)
Sunbelt	23	14	22	3	30	4	1	3	(456)
Midwest	22	12	18	4	37	3	1	2	(222)
West	27	9	16	2	36	6	2	3	(177)
							TOTAL		1329

Table II-6 shows that both sex and race-ethnicity are associated with employment assignment. In general, females are more concentrated in HEWG organizations than males who are more likely to be employed in MANU and CONS than are females. The greatest variation between groups is found in HEWG organizations where black females show an employment rate twenty-six percent (26%) greater than white males. A particularly large percentage of white males are in WRT compared to black and hispanic males who tend to be concentrated in SSRT and MANU respectively.

Table II-6

Sex, Race-Ethnicity, Place of Employment - Percent

	HEWG	MANU	WRT	TCU	SSRT	FINS	FFF	CONS	N
Black Female	39	6	15	3	28	7	--	1	(359)
White Female	26	15	20	3	28	5	1	1	(205)
Hispanic Female	32	17	19	2	20	10	--	1	(128)
Black Male	21	10	15	5	39	3	1	6	(317)
White Male	13	18	25	3	28	2	2	9	(175)
Hispanic Male	16	26	18	4	21	4	3	8	(108)
Other	25	15	5	0	40	15	0	0	(20)
								TOTAL	1312

A comparison of white versus non-white youth indicates that non-white youth outnumber whites in HEWG employment (29% to 20%). In contrast, whites show a higher rate of employment in both WRT (23% to 16%) and MANU (17% to 12%).

Differences between black and white females are few with two possible exceptions. Black young women are more likely to have obtained employment in HEWG (39% to 26%), and white women are more likely to be in MANU (15% to 6%). The heavier employment of black females in HEWG could be explained in part by operating program access to HEWG organizations. The National Council of Negro Women participants were more likely to hold employment in HEWG organizations than were participants from any other program (41%). Hispanic females are similar to other young women in employment setting although a smaller proportion, than is the case with either black or white females, are found in SSRT. There are several differences between the males which merit noting. White males, as was the case with white females, are less prevalent in HEWG than are black males. Hispanics and white males are more likely to be in MANU than are black males. Black males, on the other hand, are more heavily employed in SSRT than are either whites or hispanics.

If we ask which organizations account for at least two thirds of the employment of each sex-race-ethnicity group, we find the following:

Black Females

HEWG - 39%
SSRT - 28%
> 67%

White Females

SSRT - 28%
HEWG - 26%
WRT - 20%
> 74%

Hispanic Females

HEWG - 32%
SSRT - 20%
WRT - 19%
> 71%

Black Males

SSRT - 39%
HEWG - 21%
WRT - 15%
> 75%

White Males

SSRT - 28%
WRT - 25%
MANU - 18%
> 71%

Hispanic Males

MANU - 26%
SSRT - 21%
WRT - 18%
HEWG - 1[illegible]%
> 81%

Again, operating program access to varying employment organizations would, to some extent at least, help account for some of the observed variation in job placement. La Raza, for example, had the largest percentage of participants in MANU while National Urban League participants were more likely to find employment in WRT. More than a third (35%) of all PPV participants were working in SSRT; such was the case for only a small proportion of NUL (13%), Job Factory (14%), and La Raza youth (15%).

Age is of course an important variable in accounting for differences in employment status, hours worked, and type of job held. Similarly, there is an abundance of empirical evidence to show that educational achievement is also a critical intervening variable. Found in Table II-7 are relationships between age, educational status and place of employment. The age groupings are based upon the approximate age of the youth at the time of the employer interview. The educational status of the youth is based upon school status at the time of program entry. It is assumed that those who were school dropouts at the time the IPP form was completed remained dropouts. Further, although there would be some attrition, it is assumed that most of those who were students did go on to complete their high school studies.

School status and age (as defined above) of sample youth were examined in order to determine how these two variables were associated with job setting. Because the distributions for those classified as "students" and those classified as "graduates" were quite similar, the two were combined into a single category. Therefore, two groups are compared--high school students and graduates versus high school dropouts by two age divisions.

Table II-7

School Status and Placement of Employment - Percent

	HEWG	MANU	WRT	TCU	SSRT	FINS	FFF	CONS	N
High School Student or Graduate 18-20 yrs. old	29	14	23	2	23	7	1	1	(429)
High School Student or Graduate 21-24 yrs. old	27	12	19	4	28	9	1	1	(197)
High School Dropout 18-20 yrs. old	25	15	8	2	44	2	1	3	(212)
High School Dropout 21-24 yrs. old	24	13	15	5	34	5	1	5	(212)

The data presented in Table II-7 would more than suggest that age, at least once employment is undertaken, is not as important an explanatory variable as school or educational status, particularly among those youth ages 18 to 20 years. Dropouts, ages 18-20 years, for example, are far less likely than students or graduates to be employed in WRT (8% to 23%) and almost twice as likely to be working in SSRT organizations (44% to 23%). For the older youth,differences in educational status are less impressive, with the largest discrepancy being in SSRT employment where older dropouts show a six percent (6%) advantage. This same pattern holds true when there is control for the sex and race-ethnicity of the youth. Beyond the age of adolescence (ages 21-24), neither age nor educational status generate many differences in the employment location of program participants and controls. For younger youth (18-20), however, educational achievement does appear to play a significant role in employment.

From the data collected in this study, we are unable to determine just what job the youth hold, their wages, or whether they are full- or part-time employees. We can, though, provide some more detailed information about the organizations where they are or were employed. Such data, which deals with the characteristics of employing organizations, will shed some light on the age and racial-ethnic composition of the employing organization, as well as average entry level wages, employee benefits, and employee turnover.

Characteristics of Employing Organizations

We turn now to a discussion of the characteristics of those organizations which have participated in this study. Obviously the policies, precedures, and products of an employer will play some part in the hiring and retention of youth. Here we focus upon the size of these organizations; sex, race, and age composition of the work force; wages and benefits provided to employees; and whether or not special provisions are made for youthful employees.

Number of Employees

The average number of full-time employees (30 hours or more per week) at work during a peak period for all work sites in this sample is 274. The largest group of such employees is found in TCU where the average full-time force is 629. The next largest is FINS with an average of 614 full-time employees. Organizations in the SSRT, CONS, and FFF categories tend to be small, employing less than 100 people.

The average number of part-time and seasonal employees (30 hours or less per week) is 77. There is less variance in the number of part-time employees across organizations, with the largest being TCU again. The distributions for all eight industrial categories are presented in Table II-8 below.

Table II-8

Organization Size by Industrial Classification

	Average Number of Full-Time Employees	Average Number of Part-Time Employees
HEWG	430	104
MANU	417	52
WRT	115	56
TCU	629	114
SSRT	99	78
FINS	614	52
FFF	70	28
CONS	84	35

It is interesting to observe that SSRT is the only industrial classification which shows approximately the same average number of both full- and part-time employees. In every other type of organization, the former group outnumbers the latter. Restaurants and other organizations in the SSRT category play a significant role in youth employment. Many of these youth are employed on a part-time or temporary basis.

Employee Sex

Women constitute a larger segment of the work force than males in three types of organizations: HEWG (65%), FINS (64%) and SSRT (54%). Males outnumber females in all other organizations, particularly in CONS (85%), FFF (78%), and TCU (68%). Across organization types, the average employer in this sample reported that employees are about half male (47%) and half female (53%).

Employee Race-Ethnicity

The overall racial-ethnic composition of the work force in this sample shows that of all employees in the average organization:

57% are White
29% are Black
11% are Hispanic
3% are Other

When these percentages are compared with the distribution of employees by industrial classification in Table II-9, it is apparent that whites are over represented in MANU, FINS, and CONS. Blacks, 29% of the total sample, are over represented in HEWG, TCU, and SSRT. Hispanics, 11% of the employee sample, are over represented in FFF and MANU.

Table II-9

Employee Race-Ethnicity by Industrial Classification - Percent

	White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)	Other (%)	Total
HEWG	53	34	10	3	(100)
MANU	64	17	15	4	(100)
WRT	61	23	14	2	(100)
TCU	52	36	10	2	(100)
SSRT	53	36	7	4	(100)
FINS	67	19	10	4	(100)
FFF	60	19	19	2	(100)
CONS	69	15	13	3	(100)
Percent of all Employees	(57)	(29)	(11)	(3)	(100)

Age

The overall age composition of the employees in organizations included in this sample indicates that 16-21 year olds make up just over one-quarter ($\overline{X}$=28%) of the total work force. The average age composition across work settings is as follows:

10% are 16-18 years of age
18% are 19-21 years of age
27% are 22-29 years of age
22% are 30-39 years of age
13% are 40-49 years of age
7% are 50-59 years of age
3% are over 59 years of age

The following table illustrates employee age composition for each of the eight industrial classifications.

Table II-10

Average Employee Age and Industrial Classification

	Percent						
	16-18	19-21	22-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	59+
HEWG	8	12	25	26	16	9	4
MANU	3	15	29	23	16	9	5
WRT	10	22	26	20	12	7	3
TCU	5	14	31	28	14	7	1
SSRT	17	22	28	15	10	5	3
FINS	2	13	31	26	13	12	3
FFF	10	21	33	17	13	4	2
CONS	5	13	26	33	18	4	1
Total % of all Employees	(10)	(18)	(27)	(22)	(13)	(7)	(3)

Looking across each row, the average percentage of employees in each age group is given for each work setting. For example, in the first row, HEWG, the largest age groups are 22-29 ($\overline{X}$=25%) and 30-39 year olds ($\overline{X}$=26%). However, since our primary concern is with youth, we shall confine our summarization of Table II-10 to the 16-21 year old columns.

Combining these two columns (ages 16-18 and ages 19-21) for each industrial classification, we find that youth represent from 15% (FINS) to 39% (SSRT) of the reported work force. By using the overall average percentage of employees who are youth (28%) as a reference point, we can make some judgements as to the types of job settings where youth are either over or under-represented.

Wages

The average hourly wages earned by young employees (ages 16-21) varies by the type of employing organization. However, for all places of employment combined, the average lowest hourly wage is reported to be $3.69 and the highest is $5.52. From Table II-11 it can be seen that the lowest wages are in those occupations which have the highest percentages of young employees: SSRT, and WRT. Conversely, those occupations in which youth are a distinct minority tend to pay the highest wages: CONS, TCU, and MANU. These differential wages do, no doubt, influence job satisfaction and probably contribute to job mobility among youth.

Table II-11

Range of Hourly Wages for Young Employees*
(1981 Dollars)

	Low	Middle	High
HEWG	3.65	4.12	5.17
MANU	3.83	4.69	6.24
WRT	3.56	4.17	5.45
TCU	4.53	5.89	7.65
SSRT	3.41	3.86	4.84
FINS	3.81	4.39	5.46
CONS	5.41	7.41	9.67

*Includes average tips and commission if applicable.

Yet another interesting, but not surprising, relationship is found to exist between sex and wages. Generally, the greater the proportion of women employees in an organization, the lower the average hourly wage. The correlation between percent of male employees and average wages per hour was modest, but significantly positive (r=.25). Race and ethnicity alone does not appear to play a part in average hourly wage variations.

In summary, those organizations employing the largest proportion of youth tend to have the fewest full-time and/or permanent employees and offer the lowest hourly wages. The problem becomes even more severe for females, especially those working in organizations where women represent the majority of all employees.

Work Settings

The information received from employer respondents shows that in the vast majority (82%) of jobs that young people hold, there is a lot of group interaction among employees. Youth interaction with other employees is less frequent in MANU and TCU where one-quarter of the employers reported that little or no interaction occurred between youth and their fellow workers.

As might be anticipated from the classification of industrial organizations, the majority of work conducted by youth takes place indoors. Some 75% of the employers report this to be the case. Outdoor work is most common in FFF. A combination of indoor and outdoor work is found in TCU and CONS organizations.

Union Membership

For the majority of positions held by young employees, union requirements rarely exist. Overall, in only 16%, or one out of six work settings is such membership mandatory. Youth are much more likely to be union members if they are employed in three types of organizations: TCU (43%), CONS (41%), and MANU (26%). As noted earlier, these industries hire the smallest percentage of employees 21 years or younger.

Benefits and Entitlements

Factors other than wages are associated with job satisfaction and, in turn, job stability. Too often the benefits and entitlements of organizations are not taken into consideration when assessments are made of youth in the labor force.

Nearly three-fourths (73%) of all employer respondents report that there are "regular annual or semi-annual pay increases for young employees." Again, analysis of variations among employing organizations indicates that such favorable wage policies are more likely to be found in those companies that employ the fewest number of youth ages 16 to 21 years. This is illustrated by the following comparison of percentages of employers who have regular periodic pay increases. Note that the second set of organizations are those which employ the greatest number of youth:

I	II
FINS - 88%	WRT - 76%
MANU - 85%	HEWG - 73%
TCU - 83%	SSRT - 65%

This finding is supported by the significant negative correlation that exists between percent of youth employees and total number of benefits offered by the organization.

The relationship between employee age and wage policy does not hold up with respect to merit salary increments. All together, seventy percent (70%) of the employers provide young employees with "pay increases based on a merit system." This procedure is most frequently present in FINS (90%) and MANU (80%) organizations. Merit increments are much rarer in HEWG (59%) and other types of organizations.

No doubt there are some benefits and entitlements which are provided to all full-time employees regardless of age. At the same time, many, if not all benefits do require a probationary period of successful employment. The relatively high job mobility of young people would mean that many, at least at the entry job level, will not actually take advantage of or participate in these various entitlement programs.

Table II-12

Industrial Organizations and Benefits/Entitlements for Full-Time Employees

(Percentage of Employers Providing Each)

	HEWG	MANU	WRT	TCU	SSRT	FINS	FFF	CONS	TOTAL
Paid Holidays	81	95	79	80	54	93	62	62	74
Paid Vacations	78	92	82	80	68	96	62	56	77
Paid Sick Leave	76	57	61	73	35	88	46	48	58
Hospital or Medical	72	86	68	75	58	90	54	73	70
Educational Benefits	37	36	18	46	17	72	15	25	29
Pension Plan	39	43	32	77	18	50	23	33	34
Life Insurance	54	69	48	77	38	79	46	38	52
Profit Sharing	3	25	21	32	11	28	31	14	14
Discounts on Products	11	48	57	16	44	35	8	14	35
Free Transportation	6	4	2	7	4	7	8	10	5
Child Care Services	9	1	1	4	1	0	0	0	3
Other Fringe Benefits	18	16	15	20	21	25	23	10	18

Table II-12 shows the percentage of employers who report providing each of eleven different benefits to youth who are employed full-time. The table indicates that over two-thirds of all employing organizations offer paid holidays and vacations and hospital-medical benefits. More than half offer reimbursed sick leave and some kind of life insurance coverage. Only a handful of employers offer fringe benefits such as profit sharing, free transportation or child care services.

To simplify comprehension of the data presented in Table II-12, a summary of the highs and lows for each benefit/entitlement is shown below. Free transportation and child care benefits were omitted because so few organizations provide such benefits. Also note that because FFF is composed of so few organizations (12), it too is excluded from this summarization.

	Sectors Most Likely to Offer Benefit/ Entitlement (%)		Sectors Least Likely to Offer Benefit (%)	
Paid Holidays	MANU	95	CONS	62
	FINS	93	SSRT	54
Paid Vacations	FINS	96	SSRT	68
	MANU	92	CONS	56
Paid Sick Leave	FINS	88	CONS	48
	HEWG	76	SSRT	35
Hospital or Medical	FINS	90	WRT	68
	MANU	86	SSRT	58
Educational Benefits	FINS	72	WRT	18
	TCU	46	SSRT	17
Pension Plan	TCU	77	WRT	32
	FINS	50	SSRT	18
Life Insurance	FINS	79	SSRT	38
	TCU	77	CONS	38
Profit Sharing	TCU	32	SSRT	11
	FINS	28	HEWG	3
Discounts on Products	WRT	57	CONS	14
	MANU	48	HEWG	11

It is clear that FINS organizations are most likely to offer every benefit/ entitlement except discounts on products. Other sectors which score high as providers of several benefits are MANU and TCU. Conversely, an examination of the organizations least likely to offer each of the benefits/ entitlements shows SSRT, CONS, and WRT appearing most frequently.

It is interesting to note that there is a fairly nice fit between the likelihood of organizations offering youth employees benefits/entitlements and the average proportion of youth employees in the organization. The three highest benefit providers (FINS, MANU, and TCU) employ relatively small percentages of youth, while two of the lowest providers (SSRT and WRT) are major employers of youth.

Whether or not access to or knowledge about benefits/entitlements plays some role in job satisfaction assessments or the career judgements made by youth cannot be answered by this research. The data which is available from this particular research would suggest, however, that access to benefits/entitlements are less predictive of job mobility than is the age of the employee. Keeping in mind, of course, that age is also highly correlated with where one works, hours worked, the quality and status of that work, and how the employee is perceived by co-workers and supervisors.

The importance of age of employee as a critical and predictive variable is supported by employer responses to numerous questions asked in this survey. These data certainly make clear that employers do perceive significant differences between older and younger workers. An example of the saliency of age is found in analysis of data dealing with the hiring of new employees, entry level jobs, and job turnover.

The average number of new full-time employees hired each year was estimated by the employers interviewed to be eighty-four (84). There are significant variations between the eight types of organizations with MANU, FINS, and TCU reporting the highest annual rates of new employment. Annual full-time employment opportunities are less abundant in SSRT and WRT organizations, as can be seen in the following table.

Table II-13

New Hires, Percent Youth, and Job Turnover Rate

	HEWG	MANU	WRT	TCU	SSRT	FINS	FFF	CONS	TOTAL
No. New Full-time Employees Hired Annually	101	121	36	120	70	121	30	90	84
Percent New Full-time Employees Who Are Youth	35%	38%	50%	42%	50%	36%	51%	40%	43%
Annual Entry-Level Job Turnover Rate	33%	39%	38%	33%	71%	31%	42%	63%	47%

The percentage of youth in the pool of new full-time employees ranges from 50% (SSRT and WRT) to 35% (HEWG). Although the range is only 15%, it is interesting to note that the estimates of SSRT and WRT employers confirm earlier findings that the percentages of youth employees are greatest in these two organizations.

The overall turnover rate indicates that about one out of two entry level employees are replaced on an annual basis. With the exception of SSRT and CONS, the entry level turnover rate is fairly constant among all other organizational types. Because the majority of new full-time youth employees are hired into entry level jobs, there is a modest but significant positive correlation between the proportion of youth employed in the organization and the entry level job turnover rate (r=.23). This is supported by the fact that SSRT organizations hire more youth than other types of organizations and they also report the highest average entry level job turnover rate ($\overline{X}$=71%). However, it should be noted that WRT organizations are also leaders in youth employment and they report a relatively modest average turnover rate (33%). Hence, we can conclude that the variations in entry level job turnover can be explained partially but not solely by differences in the age composition of organizations. Other factors related to employee characteristics must explain why turnover rates are higher in some organizations. The overall sex or racial-ethnic characteristics of the work force did not explain a significant amount of the variance in employee turnover rates. Correlations of percent male and percent white employees with turnover rate were insignificantly small. However, two other characteristics of the work environment which are related to employee age are also related to turnover rate: salary and benefits. As already noted, correlations of salary and number of benefits with percent of employees 21 years and younger were modest but significant (r=-.24 and r=-.29 respectively). From these negative correlations it may be concluded that in general, organizations with larger percentages of youth employees tend to offer their staff lower pay and fewer benefits. In addition, correlations of salary and benefits with turnover rate were small but significant (r=-.11 and r=-.12 respectively).

This conclusion may not explain differences in turnover rates for the eight categories of organizations as they are currently classified. For example, WRT organizations hire the same proportion of youth employees into entry level jobs as SSRT and offer only slightly better wages and benefits than SSRT, but have only about half as large of an employee turnover rate. This may be due to the fact that SSRT industries, which are composed largely of food outlets, restaurants, and service stations, are perceived by youth as temporary, gap filling places of employment. WRT organizations may be viewed as presenting more opportunities for the future. As will be discussed in Chapter V, youth's assessments of the role and status of various work settings is not that different from the perceptions and assessments of adults. In fact, many employers applaud the courage and motivation of youth who do leave entry level jobs in pursuit of challenging and rewarding work.

A little more than three-fourths (77%) of the employers state that the job turnover rate is higher among younger than older workers. As can be seen in the following distribution, agreement with this statement does not vary too much across industrial classifications:

	Percent Agree "Turnover Rate is Higher For Young Employees" (%)
HEWG	73
MANU	78
WRT	78
TCU	69
SSRT	81
FINS	85
FFF	85
CONS	61

No matter what type of organization, the majority of employer respondents believe that youth are more likely to depart entry level jobs than are adult workers. Again, however, it should be noted that this assessment does not always reflect negative attitudes toward youth on the part of employers.

Hiring

Responsibility for hiring of new youth employees was investigated by asking respondents, "In this organization, who makes the final decision in hiring youth?" Responses are distributed almost evenly between:

Only the Supervisor	32%	
Supervisor and Other Administrators	31%	
The "Front Office" or Personnel Office	28%	
Other	9%	
	100%	N=1308

Hiring of youth by the supervisor alone was most characteristic of the two organizations which hire the largest proportions of youth, SSRT (42%) and WRT (32%). Organizations most likely to require a cooperative hiring effort were the typically white collar, professional employers, FINS (43%) and HEWG (40%). However, hiring in FINS organizations is also frequently the responsibility of the front office or personnel office (34%). Centralized hiring is the most frequent selection procedure followed in TCU (43%) which, like FINS, tend to be large organizations.

Having some knowledge of and understanding about hiring practices of organizations should be of value to youth seeking work. Presentation of self as a serious job candidate may be enhanced by awareness of the actual procedures of application, interviewing, and hiring.

Over two-thirds (68%) of organizations do have a fixed probationary period for all new employees. An additional four percent (4%) say that their probation policy applies only to employees filling certain job slots. Only one employer specifies that his company's probation policy applies only to youth employees.

While nearly three-quarters (74%) of the organizations provide new employees with some type of orientation program, only nine (9) employing organizations offer special orientation programs for new youth employees. Another four percent (4%) provide such programs for select employees who will be filling "special" job slots. There is some variation among the eight types of organizations with regard to the offering of orientation activities, with HEWG organizations being the most inclined to offer them (86%) and CONS companies the least likely (52%).

Less than one-quarter of the organizations say that supervisors of youth employees are offered instruction in how to deal with young people. Youth sensitivity programs are provided most frequently by HEWG (37%) employers. Although these organizations are not the major employers of youth in general, they do account for a large number of job placements of youth in this study. As noted earlier, given the large number of non-profit agencies in the HEWG classification, it is not surprising that so many of these agencies provide special training for youth supervisors.

It is interesting to note that less than one-fifth of the organizations which are major employers of youth have implemented special sensitivity training sessions for youth supervisors. Only 22% of the SSRT companies and 15% of the WRT firms offer this instruction to supervisors. Evidently the managers of these companies have concluded either that investment in this type of instruction are not worth potential benefits, or experience has taught them that such supervisor awareness activities are of little value. As will be discussed in Chapter V, many employers feel that young employees have immature and irresponsible work attitudes which will not be greatly altered because of changes in supervisor behavior. In addition, among SSRT employers, there is the conviction that entry level youth employees view their placements as temporary jobs rather than long range career commitments. The large turnover of youth in these organizations would support their conviction that youth are less committed to their jobs than other employees and hence, there is little the employing organization can do to offset or modify youth behavior.

Less than one out of ten (8%) respondents say that their organizations provide a job counselor solely for youth employees. Such staff are most likely to be found in HEWG organizations which, again, have employed a very large number of youth from federal job training programs.

While few organizations provide specialized job counseling for youth alone, many do provide some kind of counseling services to all employees. The counseling area and percentage of employers who provide each type of service are:

Employee relations problems - 52%
Personal problems - 47%
Career planning - 35%

The organizations which most frequently report offering each of the above forms of counseling are HEWG, TCU, and FINS. It therefore seems that counseling services are less accessible in those organizations where youth are a large portion of the total full-time work force. Again, there is evidence that in those organizations where youth represent a significant proportion of employees, particularly at the entry level, there is less available in the way of "holding" or "retention" factors. There is less counseling and guidance; less investment in training supervisors; lower wages; fewer benefits and entitlements; and limited conviction that it is possible or even desirable to attempt to alter the work behavior of entry level youth employees.

Once youth gain full-time employment they are subject to policies, practices, benefits, employer expectations, and conditions applicable to all full-time employees. In some cases, organizations will attempt to better prepare supervisors so that they might be more sensitive to and aware of youth attitudes and behavior. Still, there is little evidence to suggest that employing organizations have either formalized or implemented age based work policies or practices. Age is of course an important variable in who is hired, where, and for what kinds of work. Employers, as will be pointed out in other chapters of this report, do have very firm opinions about how younger employees differ from older employees.

The point here is that once full-time employment is achieved, young workers are supposed to be treated no differently than full-time employees. Whether or not such is the reality of the matter cannot be determined in this particular inquiry.

CHAPTER III: ENTERING THE JOB MARKET: BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT

That youth encounter a variety of barriers and hurdles in seeking out gainful employment has been well documented by other researchers. An excellent example of such inquiry is found in the work represented by Michael Borus and his associates at Ohio State University.[1] The NLS data make quite clear that factors such as age, sex, race, and ethnicity do act as barriers to employment and will account for variations in earnings and benefits. The NLS data, as is the case with similar studies, is based upon information collected from youth respondents. These data reflect the experiences and recollection of the youth themselves. In this chapter we look at the matter of barriers from the perspective of the employer. The question asked is:

> "What are the qualifications and criteria utilized by employers in their assessment of youthful job applicants?"

Further, how do these qualifications and criteria vary by type of employing organization?

In Table III-1 are the distribution of responses to two questions:

I: Which of the following are qualifications for full-time positions to which youth might apply?

II: Which of the following should be qualifications for full-time positions to which youth might apply?

Clearly, these are declared qualifications and do not reflect hidden discriminatory barriers such as race, sex, ethnicity, or other illegal or culturally inappropriate screening criteria. Respondents were not asked, for obvious reasons, if they did in fact discriminate or establish qualifications based upon sex or race.

---

[1] Pathways to the Future, Volume I. A report on the National Longitudinal Surveys on Youth Labor Market Experience, 1979. Michael E. Borus and associates of Ohio State University Center for Human Resource Research.

On the one hand are those qualifications which are being utilized and on the other, those qualifications which employer respondents feel should be utilized.

Table III-1

Qualifications for Full-Time Employment for Youth

Qualification	Qualifications Utilized % Yes	Qualifications Desired % Yes	D> U
Age	85	81	(-4)
Ability to Read	83	89	(+6)
Personal Appearance	82	85	(+3)
Ability to Write	81	87	(+6)
Ability to do Basic Math	69	76	(+7)
Job Training by Employing Organization	68	71	(+3)
Job References	62	66	(+4)
Previous Job Training or Work Experience	32	39	(+7)
Physical Examination	32	42	(+10)
High School Diploma	30	43	(+13)

Table III-1 provides a number of interesting and perhaps striking outcomes. All employers declare some level of qualifications or criteria for youth employment. All but a small percentage of organizations have at least four requirements which youth must meet in order to become employed full-time:

44% have 7 to 10 qualifications
44% have 4 to 6 qualifications
12% have 1 to 3 qualifications

Further, as many employers place an importance upon the need for an ability to read and write as cite the saliency of personal appearance. Interestingly, previous job training or work experience ranks at the bottom of the qualification ladder. This finding might not be considered surprising given the fact that most youth are hired at the entry job level. On the other hand, Table III-1 does show that almost two-thirds (62%) of employers note that references from previous employers is a qualification for full-time employment. Hence, further evidence is provided of the importance employers place on work related attitudes and behavior as opposed to job skills and job training.

Shifting to the right hand column of Table III-1, it can be observed that most employer respondents do endorse the qualifications established by their organizations. In only one case (age) is there any drop in the difference between qualifications practiced and qualifications preferred. That qualification is age and the difference is four percent (4%). The greatest discrepancy is found in the matter of the high school diploma as a barrier to youthful full-time employment. Although fewer than one-third of the respondents report that their organizations do require a high school diploma--nearly half of the respondents believe that the possession of the diploma should be a job entrance qualification. The value placed upon the holding of a high school diploma may have as much to do with the seeking of certified evidence of appropriate cognitive skills as it does with seeking evidence of stability and responsibility. The military, for example, has concluded that the single best predictor of attrition during the first term of military enlistment is earning of the high school diploma. Again, not because the high school diploma is in itself a guarantee of ability to read at a minimal level or to solve rudimentary math problems, but rather as a symbol of endurance, stability and determination. For many employers, it is speculated, completing high school is considered indicative of the proper work attitude.

While there are high levels of consensus among employers as to the necessity for entrance qualifications, there are significant qualifications by employers in different industrial organizations.

Breakdowns by industrial classification produce the following ranges in terms of the percentage of organizations requiring each entrance qualification:*

Qualification	High Percentage Requiring	Low Percentage Requiring
Age	FINS (93%) TCU (92%)	CONS (73%) WRT (84%)
Ability to Read	FINS (98%) HEWG (89%)	CONS (66%) SSRT (77%)
Personal Appearance	FINS (97%) SSRT (87%)	CONS (53%) MANU (61%)
Ability to Write	FINS (98%) HEWG (86%)	CONS (63%) MANU (75%)
Ability to do Basic Math	FINS (85%) WRT (82%)	CONS (60%) MANU (61%)
Job Training by Employing Organization	FINS (83%) HEWG (71%)	TCU (59%) MANU (62%)
Job References	FINS (69%) HEWG (66%)	SSRT (59%) WRT (60%)
Previous Job Training or Work Experience	CONS (61%) TCU (49%)	WRT (24%) SSRT (28%)
Physical Examination	TCU (60%) HEWG (60%)	SSRT (13%) WRT (19%)
High School Diploma	FINS (64%) HEWG (50%)	SSRT (16%) CONS (17%)

*FFF was omitted due to small sample size (N=13).

Of the ten practiced entrance qualifications, nine are most fully embraced by organizations falling within the FINS and HEWG, typically white collar grouping. It is only in the demand for a previous training or work experience where FINS and HEWG employers are not the most stringent in job entrance qualifications.

It would be reasonable to assume that there would be some positive correlation between number and kinds of entrance qualifications and such factors as employee wages, benefits, and entitlements. Analysis of these data would suggest that such is not always the case. For example, construction organizations (CONS) report the highest average hourly wages for young employees, but rank among the lowest of all organizational groupings in qualification demands. FINS is highest in both entrance qualification expectations and employee benefits, yet average in reported hourly wages. TCU organizations are not among the leaders in entrance qualifications or benefits, but are among the highest in average hourly wages paid to youth employees. HEWG organizations are low, in comparison to other organizations, in both number and kind of benefits and wages, yet do report that potential employees must meet quite a few entrance qualifications.

The two organizational types where the expected relationship between qualification and wages-benefits is found are SSRT and WRT. Both pay lower average hourly wages, provide comparatively little in the way of benefits and impose very few entrance level employment barriers. The two also report having the largest proportion of 16-21 year old employees. The age factor does then appear as a critical variable in explaining differences in entry level qualifications, wages, and benefits.

Generally, the findings are reflective of a system which operates efficiently in absorbing new young workers into those jobs which are viewed as being most appropriate for young, first time, entry level novices. The gates are opened most widely to the unskilled and inexperienced for entry into those jobs which demand the least in the way of experience or skill.

That the system operates efficiently in channeling many young people into limited job openings is not to say that the system operates effectively or equitably. For one, it tends to treat youth as a monolith--utilizing age as a critical and frequently overriding variable. For another it utilizes entry qualifications which may in fact be unrelated to job performance. Third, it may not allow some youth to practice and apply already acquired job skills. Fourth, it restricts the range of work opportunities and work settings available to the young. Fifth, it is a system which lacks consistency in matching qualification with job assignment, wages, and benefits. It places, with few exceptions, strong emphasis upon educational credentials without much apparent evidence of the need for and benefits to be derived from such credentials. Finally, it is a system which continues to perpetuate the popular myth of youth as individuals incapable of being serious, responsible, and productive workers. Again, the young are channeled into jobs where, full time or not, there is little expectation on the part of the employer or employee that the young worker will remain with that job. Both employer and employee view the job as temporary, a stepping stone at best, a first stop on the road to more attractive, more challenging adult work.

These are jobs made easy to obtain and easy to leave. Yet, when the young employee does leave, the reaction on the part of many employers and much of the public is frequently one of hostility and wonderment.

It would be more reasonable and realistic to view these jobs as "kid jobs for kids." Puzzlement would be more understanding if in fact young people chose to remain with these less desirable entry level jobs on more than a temporary basis. No doubt an adult retaining similar employment would be considered lacking in motivation, ambition, or intelligence.

Some 85% of the employers report that the age of the youthful applicant is a critical factor in hiring for full-time jobs. The most liberal cutoff was age 16, the policy of 46% of the employers. As might be expected, those most likely to accept full-time workers at age 16 are organizations which have the largest proportion of young workers: SSRT and WRT. Only a small percentage of the remainder of employers required that youth be older than age 18. More than one-half of the employers in MANU, TCU, and CONS required that youth be 18 or older in order to seek full-time employment.

Age is an important factor and should be considered in both the design of youth employment programs and in the expectations of youth. Providing intensive job skill training to youth under age 18 may result in discouragement for those who will not find the opportunity to apply those skills until a later age. Employers who hire the youngest of youth are more inclined to stress the importance of proper work attitude and educational qualifications rather than job skills.

As illustrated in Table III-1, next to age, ability to read and write and personal appearance are the most prevelant employment qualifications. Fewer employers required an ability to do basic mathematics, although it was listed as a qualification by over two-thirds of them.

The need for a sound educational background, particularly in the basic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic, is quite prevelant in the responses of employers. Certainly the data obtained from employers would support the proposition that at the entry level at least these basic educational skills are considered to be more important than prior work experience or job training. Further, many employers feel that much of the problem of youth unemployment could be reduced were our public schools to function more effectively in the education of the young. The question of just what is required to enhance the successful employability of youth, more specifically disadvantaged youth, does have serious policy implications. There are those who would take the position that basic education-educational achievement is the most salient factor in explaining high rates of unemployment among low income youth. Others place a greater emphasis upon the lack of work experience and marketable job skills. Still others would argue that the most important variables are motivation and attitude. That youth, again more specifically low income youth, for whatever the reasons, lack the necessary desire to obtain and hold employment. No doubt each of these factors as well as cyclical economic conditions, discrimination, minimum wage, and demographic shifts do impact on who among the young look for what types of jobs, job behavior, job retention, and job mobility.[1]

More recently in a U.S. General Accounting Office report entitled, "Labor Market Problems of Teenagers Results Largely from Doing Poorly in School," findings were presented which are quite contrary to prevalent wisdom.

---

[1] John Cogan, "The Decline in Black Teenage Employment, 1950-1970." A working paper from the National Bureau of Economic Research; Hoover Institution, 1981.

Namely, this G.A.O. report states:

> "Measured unemployment is not a good indicator of how many teenagers are having serious labor market problems. This conclusion was reached by G.A.O. which also reports that not doing well in school is a major component of the problem.
>
> G.A.O. could find no evidence that being out of work occasionally as a teenager had any adverse effect on future job success or on the tendency to commit crime while a teenager."[2]

More pertinent to our discussion is the following point made by the G.A.O.:

> "This information on the types of services the youth receive in employment and training programs suggests that recent Federal programs have emphasized meeting the immediate and short term need for jobs. The results of our analysis suggests a very different emphasis. In our view, the characteristics of youths indicate that a far greater need exists for services designed to enhance their basic skills and employability.[3]

Further, the G.A.O. report goes on to make the following needs estimates:

> "Using the subgroup characteristics to assess the types of services required, we conclude that among disadvantaged youths, 184,000 need jobs, 644,000 need their basic skills improved, and 134,000 need both jobs and remedial services."[4]

---

[2] "Labor Market Problems of Teenagers." U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C., March 29, 1982.

[3] Ibid, P. 46

[4] Ibid, p. 52

Citation of these findings does not imply endorsement by the co-authors of this report. In fact we would raise some very serious questions as to what we see as puzzling leaps between data and conclusions. Inclusion here is rather to make the point that there is little consensus among researchers as to the specific factors which do contribute to the employment experience and behavior of different segments of the youth population. Further, that the conclusions drawn by G.A.O.--that is the significance of basic educational skills as an enhancer of youth employability--as opposed to job training and job experience--is certainly supported by what employers told us they look for when hiring low income, entry level youth.

Although this research cannot answer the question as to what employers consider to be an "ability to read," "ability to write," or "ability to do basic mathematics," an attempt was made to learn more about how employers assessed the abilities of youthful applicants. They were asked what tests or procedures are used to select youth for jobs in order to find out how they make judgements about the abilities of applicants.

The outcomes of this particular inquiry are surprising and puzzling and suggest perhaps that while employers do pay lip service to the importance of basic education skills, other entry criteria may be of equal or even greater importance. On the one hand, as has already been noted, employers state that they have entrance qualifications and believe these qualifications need be enforced. On the other hand, as Table III-2 illustrates, only a small percentage of employers say that they have standardized procedures in place for selection among young employment candidates.

Table III-2

Procedures Used in Selecting Youth Applicants

Procedure	Percent Using
Civil Service Test	5
Oral Test	10
Written Test	18
Performance Test	19
Personal Interview	97

While virtually all employers require a personal interview, few require tests of any form. Since twice as many employers require basic reading and writing skills as require a high school diploma, how employers measure these skills remains a mystery. Clearly, assessment is not made through standardized tests or on the basis of some objective measurement. The absence of measurable or performance criteria probably contributes to suspicions of discrimination among youth; that is, sex or race, not ability or motivation, is the critical variable in who gets hired. No doubt there is some practice of statistical discrimination on the part of some employers. That is, employers may prefer to hire members of certain groups (e.g., whites, males, adults, high school graduates) because, on the average, members of that group have more of the characteristics conducive to good job performance.

As Paula England points out:

> "By using group averages to make hiring decisions, employers avoid the costs of getting the information from each individual applicant that would allow them to predict productivity thus, statistical discrimination occurs whenever an individual is judged on the basis of the average characteristics of the group...to which he or she belongs rather than upon his or her own personal characteristics."[5]

---

[5] Paula England, "Explanations of Occupational Sex Segregation: An Interdisciplinary Review," Unpublished manuscript, January, 1981.

Again, this research can neither confirm nor deny the existence of age, sexual, racial, and educational discrimination in the youth job market. What the data do tell us is that the majority of employing organizations do not provide youthful candidates with tests or some other format which would provide the employer with evidence of the candidates writing, reading or arithmetic ability. The personal interview and prior work references, while helpful and even necessary, are not sufficient to assess those cognitive skills which most employers say applicants must possess if they are to qualify for full-time employment. Those organizations which use tests most frequently are those which employ smaller proportions of youth. This finding is illustrated in the following list of tests and the types of employers who use them the most frequently:

Performance Tests:	FINS 37%	TCU 32%
Written Tests:	HEWG 38%	TCU 30%
Oral Tests:	HEWG 17%	TCU 11%
Civil Service Tests:	HEWG 16%	TCU 16%

It was also discovered that larger organizations (those who employ more people), have more selection procedures (r=.16).

As there are qualifications for job entrance, there are also behaviors or conditions which would disqualify youth from full-time employment. In Table III-3 are presented the percentage responses to a question dealing with the factors which would disqualify youth from getting a job.

Table III-3

Factors Which Disqualify Youth For Employment

Disqualification	Percent Using Factor
Record of Drug Abuse	43
Record of Alcoholism	37
Prison Record	35
Arrest Record	28
Limited English Speaking Ability	22
Handicaps (visual, speech, etc.)	20
Other Health Problems	18
Indebtedness	8
Overweight	7

The disqualifications listed cover a wide range of behaviors and conditions, including asocial or delinquent attributes as well as those over which the applicant may have little control. Not surprisingly, it is evidence of the former which is most likely to preclude youth from employment. How employers learn about past transgressions of applicants or what flexibility they practice in making judgements about the severity of an offense cannot be determined by this particular study. What these data do show is that there is much more consensus among employers in the area of entrance qualifications than there is in the matter of disqualifications. It should be noted from Table III-3 that no single disqualification was endorsed by a majority of the employer respondents. These findings suggest that employers place more importance on the applicant's ability to read or write than they do on the applicant's behavioral record. Obviously this conclusion cannot be drawn from this study. On the contrary, the stress which respondents consistently place on proper work attitude and behavior of youth would suggest that the importance of behavioral disqualifications is being understated. Had the question, for example, been worded, "Which of the following is most likely to prevent you from employing a youthful applicant: a record of drug use or an inability to do basic mathematics?" the outcome might have been quite different from that which was obtained in this study. A future research inquiry dealing in greater detail with the weight employers place upon qualifications and disqualifications would help to clarify inconsistencies in this area.

There are a number of interesting and significant differences between the eight organizational clusters in how their representatives rank these disqualifications. For those disqualifications endorsed by at least a fifth of the respondents we find the following variations:

Disqualification	High Percentage Endorsing	Low Percentage Endorsing
Record of Drug Abuse	WRT (53%)	MANU (35%)
	TCU (46%)	CONS (27%)
Record of Alcoholism	WRT (41%)	FINS (28%)
	SSRT (41%)	CONS (23%)
Prison Record	FINS (59%)	MANU (18%)
	WRT (42%)	CONS (10%)
Arrest Record	FINS (41%)	MANU (11%)
	WRT (36%)	CONS (10%)
Limited English Speaking Ability	FINS (32%)	MANU (12%)
	TCU (25%)	CONS (18%)
Handicaps (visual, speech, etc.)	CONS (35%)	FINS (15%)
	TCU (32%)	HEWG (13%)

One possible explanation for the pattern of organizations in the first column of percentages is that WRT and FINS are composed largely of white collar organizations where employees handle large amounts of currency and frequently interact with customers. Therefore it makes sense that the employment of youth with records of delinquency or asocial behavior would be prohibited in these work settings.

Physical handicaps are important barriers for youth seeking employment in CONS and TCU organizations, many of which require physical stamina and endurance. However, looking at the second column of percentages, it is clear that CONS organizations, along with those in MANU, are the most lenient in their willingness to hire youth who would be disqualified from working in other settings.

Whether the interpretations offered do represent organizational reality and intent cannot be determined here. More important, however, is an understanding of the practices and behaviors of employers in the screening of youth who are seeking full-time, and for the most part, entry level employment. Entry level is stressed since for youth, that is precisely the level at which the majority of youth do enter full-time employment. We have found though, that entrances into the labor market, even at the novice level, is not without its barriers and at times questionable practices. Employers do set qualifications for job entry and a significant number, though not the majority, will disqualify applicants who fail to meet certain behavioral, verbal, and health expectations. We have found that there seems to be more in the way of qualifications than disqualifications; though this result may be more the product of the way questions were structured than a reflection of reality.

CHAPTER IV: EMPLOYER EXPERIENCES WITH AND ASSESSMENTS OF YOUTH EMPLOYEES

There is more than a little consensus among employers as to what they believe are the areas in which entry level youth employees are in need of better preparation. Table IV-1 illustrates the distribution of responses to the question:

> "Which of the following are the three areas in which there is the greatest need for young employees to be better prepared?"

Table IV-1

Employers' Impressions of Preparation Needs

Area	Percentage of Agreement
Work Attitudes	75
Basic Education	56
Knowledge of Proper Behavior on the Job	56
Job Skills	36
Interpersonal Relations	33
Technical Education	16

As Table IV-1 indicates, three quarters of all respondents note the need for better preparation in the area of work attitudes. "Work attitudes" is hardly a specific term and no doubt encompasses a wide range of behaviors. A better fix on just what employers mean by "work attitudes" is discussed in Chapter V of this report. In that chapter the focus is upon how employers compare older and younger workers. For the moment it is sufficient to point out that when respondents talk about the less than desirable work attitudes of the young they are referring to both the unpredictability of working youth and perhaps a perception of youth as lacking a serious adultlike, commitment to the employer and the job. The unpredictability of these young workers is manifest in tardiness, absenteeism, and abrupt, unannounced departures from the job. Adults, as will be noted in Chapter V, are considered to be more dependable, reliable, and predictable. Since youth have fewer familial and financial obligations they can, according to employers, be somewhat more cavalier in their job behaviors. While employers recognize that the young do have this greater flexibility and frequently leave a current job for a better job, they would prefer to see much more in the way of traditional, adult-like job behavior. They want to see behavior and attitudes which are more reflective of an appreciation for, and concern with the needs and expectations of the employer.

Table IV-1 shows also that a majority of employers see a need for improvement in the basic educational background of youthful employees. Knowledge of proper behavior on the job is also mentioned by over one-half of the respondents. Specific job skills and interpersonal relations have the endorsement of about a third of the employers. The area least frequently mentioned is "technical education."

The lack of emphasis placed upon job skills and technical education is not surprising given the nature of the jobs assigned to entry level employees. In most cases these are not jobs which require significant technical skill or specialization. They are jobs which call for a minimal level of verbal and math skills and some assurance of employee dependability. The employers expect a warm body capable of handling rudimentary responsibilities and functions. Therefore the outcomes to this question should not be too surprising. At this level of employment, the employers do not expect youth who will be well versed in advanced job skills or technical education. What they do expect is the mastery of basic academic skills, adherence to the work schedule, and awareness of appropriate employee behavior.

Table IV-2

Organizational Type and Preparation Needs

Preparation Needs	HEWG	MANU	WRT	TCU	SSRT	FINS	FFF	CONS
Work Attitudes	72	77	77	73	80	68	69	62
Basic Education	64	53	59	64	49	71	46	35
Knowledge of Proper Behavior on the Job	50	60	54	59	63	44	62	38
Job Skills	40	40	34	25	28	44	23	58
Interpersonal Relations	36	20	33	39	35	31	38	25
Technical Education	18	25	11	14	10	21	8	33
N	(352)	(173)	(239)	(44)	(388)	(68)	(13)	(52)

In Table IV-2 the six perceived needs areas are examined for each of the eight organizational types. Certain aspects of the pattern of responses support the conclusions drawn from Table IV-1. Although a majority of respondents feel that there is a great need for young employees to be better prepared in work attitudes and appropriate on-the-job behavior, those in SSRT are most likely to state these as two areas of paramount importance. Improvement in basic education, job skills, and technical education are viewed as important the least frequently by SSRT employers.

Emphasis on basic education is most evident in FINS organizations where youth would be most inclined to be assigned paperwork. Similarly, job skills are also frequently endorsed by FINS employers. Organizations where manual skills are required (CONS, MANU) express the strongest need for improved job skills and technical education. There is less variance across organizational classification with respect to the importance that the employers place on interpersonal relations. However, this quality is of least concern in organizations where typically a great deal of physical labor is conducted (CONS, MANU).

Although it can be assumed that regardless of the type of organization, youth are most likely to fill entry level jobs, it is apparent from Table IV-2 that those entry level jobs have very different requirements. Entry level jobs in some organizations demand cognitive or technical skills while others simply require appropriate work attitudes and a certain degree of commitment. However, adolescence is a developmental stage characterized by experimentation, mobility, and the desire for immediate gratification; traits which usually do not result in loyalty to an employer.

To substantiate the adolescent developmental picture described earlier, we can look at the reasons why young people leave their employment. Three reasons are cited by employer respondents. They are listed below in order of the frequency with which each is said to be the most typical reason for the termination of employment for youth:

1.	Voluntary Termination (quit)	73%
2.	Laid Off	13%
3.	Involuntary Termination (fired)	14%

According to employers, in seven out of ten cases, youth choose to leave a current job. In the rest of the cases departure is explained almost evenly by involuntary termination or a reduction in work force.

As the following table displays, there are significant differences in factors associated with job separation across industrial organizations.

Table IV-3

Most Typical Reason for Youth Termination of Employment by Organization Type

Reason	HEWG	MANU	WRT	TCU	SSRT	FINS	FFF	CONS
Quit	70	76	75	65	78	83	77	44
Fired	11	13	17	14	17	12	0	6
Laid Off	19	11	8	21	5	5	23	50

Voluntary termination occurs most frequently in FINS organizations. As was noted in Chapter III, these organizations tend to have relatively high job entrance qualifications and employ only older (19-21 year old) youth. Older youth and those who are selected more carefully probably have better qualifications and are therefore able to quit their jobs in favor of more attractive employment. In fact, when FINS employers were asked for the most typical reason why youth voluntarily quit their jobs, acceptance of a better job was the response of the majority (58%). This was least likely to be the case among CONS employees (34%) who may be restricted in finding better employment due to union control. Combining all industrial classifications, employers state the following as the most popular reasons for youth quitting their jobs:

Acceptance of a better job (higher pay, better hours, etc.)	43%
Uninterested in work (no reason specified)	33%
Personal Reasons (family, child-birth, etc.)	24%

Although there is little variance among organizations with respect to the percentage of employers who feel that youth quit because they are uninterested in work, this reason is particularly popular among MANU (36%) and SSRT (35%) employers. Personal reasons for quitting are cited most frequently in CONS (34%) and TCU (32%), organizations which are typically unionized.

Involuntary termination (firing) is most frequent in SSRT and WRT, the two organizations which employ the largest proportion of youth, particularly 16-18 year olds. These organizations may also be characterized as having lenient employee selection procedures. Therefore, involuntary termination seems to be most typical of those organizations employing younger teens into jobs which require only minimal skills.

Across all organizations, the following five reasons are cited by employers as being among the three most typical ones for youth being fired:

Absenteeism	72%
Inadequate job performance	50%
Improper attitude	45%
Tardiness	43%
Deviation from work rules	35%

Firing is predicated on tardiness and absenteeism most often in MANU industries. Interestingly, firing is based on improper attitude most often in SSRT and WRT organizations, both of which are major employers of youth. Deviation from work rules and inadequate job performance result in firing most often in FINS organizations.

Involuntary termination and quitting are not common in CONS organizations which are often unionized and where employees are expected to have some trade skills and technical expertise upon job entry. However, lay offs are reported to be highest in CONS industries where high interest rates affect employee termination decisions.

Employers were asked to indicate which problems they perceive to be serious among their youth employees. The average employer noted three serious problems from the list of ten shown in Table IV-3. The problems selected for this question were meant to represent a wide range of attitudinal, behavioral, and conditional factors which migh affect employee performance.

Table IV-3

Problems of Youth Employees as Perceived by Supervisors

Problem	Percent Selecting
Improper Attitude	64
Transportation	38
Domestic Problems	30
Drugs	25
Child Care	19
Drinking	19
Trouble with the Law	11
Health Problems	7
Language Difficulties	6
Indebtedness	7
Other	11
	(N=1329)

One interesting feature of the table above is that the only problem which generated agreement from more than one-half of the respondents is "improper attitude." The fact that maintenance of an appropriate work attitude is a particular problem among youth will be further supported by the comments of employers discussed in Chapter V.

Comparison data on older and younger workers was not collected for each of the other nine problem areas. Hence, it is impossible to conclude whether the next three most important issues, transportation, domestic problems, and drugs are more problematic for younger or older employees. Although the question did specify that supervisors respond with reference to youth employees, the problems they list may be problems among older workers as well. Regardless of which population suffers more, many of the problems are no doubt exacerbated by the age and socio-economic status of young entry level workers.

Less than one-quarter of the employers agree on the seriousness of more than four of the ten problems listed. For those problems deemed important by at least 25% of the respondents, the following variations occur among industrial organization types:

Improper Attitude: This is a problem cited about equally as frequently by all employers except those in CONS, only 50% of whom consider their youth employees to have an attitude problem.

Transportation: This problem is of about equal concern to all employers, regardless of organizational type.

Domestic Problems: Problems at home are of particular concern to HEWG employers, 39% of whom checked this response.

Drugs: Drug abuse is of especially great concern to those and MANU employers, and of least concern to those in FINS.

After addressing the problems of youth, employers were asked whether their organization makes any accommodations for young employees (i.e., create jobs, modify or change rules, etc.). Across all organizations, 32% of the employers say that they do make accomodations for youth. Their responses by industrial classification are given in the table below.

Table IV-4

Organization Type and Accomodations Made for Youth

	HEWG	MANU	WRT	TCU	SSRT	FINS	FFF	CONS
Yes	42	21	27	39	31	30	31	22
No	58	79	73	61	69	70	69	78

HEWG and TCU organizations are more inclined to make accommodations for youth than other employers. It may be that several of the organizations in both of these categories are nonprofit or public sector agencies which have more leeway in bending their policies for certain employees.

Some of the employers who said that their organizations do make accommodations for youth explained the ways in which such accommodations are made. The most frequently reported accommodation was allowing flexible hours so that youth can work around their school schedule. Several employers did not mention time schedules specifically but rather "general flexibility to accommodate youth." The next most popular area in which accommodations are made is hiring. Employers reported hiring youth from government programs, special school programs and hiring youth for summer jobs. In addition to scheduling and hiring, several employers say that they "do not demand as much of youth and give them extra support." Certain jobs are created or targeted for youth who are given an "easy break-in period." In some cases, youth are hired without experience and "trained from scratch." Only a few employers mention providing transportation or flexible hours due to child care or transportation problems.

Although this particular study does focus upon the attitudes and experiences of youth employers there are certain data provided by youth employees which would be helpful to this discussion of job retention and attrition.

Through a merging of information from the eight month follow up study and the employer survey, it is possible to locate the most recent full time job held by program participants within the framework of the eight-part industrial organization classification system. In this way we are able to learn more about the relationship between organizational work setting and job assignment.

The commentary which follows is based upon data obtained only from program participants who currently held or had held full-time jobs. The sample size for this set of items was N=376 because eight month follow-up data was only available for the spring 1981 (Phase I) youth.

Each question is presented with the distribution of responses for the eight organization types.

What Are Your Feelings About the Kinds of Work You Do (Did)?

Percent

	HEWG	WRT	SSRT	MANU	FINS	TCU	CONS	FFF	TOTAL
Great--I like it a lot	56	35	40	38	54	25	80	20	44
It's OK	42	59	54	59	46	75	20	80	52
Don't like the work at all	2	6	6	3	--	--	--	--	4
N=	102	82	79	58	28	12	10	5	(376)

Keeping in mind the significant variation in sample sizes between the eight organizational types, we find satisfaction to be highest among youth employed in CONS and lowest for those in TCU. The two non-customer oriented, white collar organizations, HEWG and FINS, receive an enthusiastic evaluation from a little more than half of their youthful employees. The very small number of youth indicating a strong distaste for their work can be attributed to the high rate of job mobility among young people. As noted earlier, these youth do not stay with jobs which they consider to be unsatisfactory.

There is much more in the way of diversity of opinion when program participants are asked a question dealing with wages.

How's Your Pay for the Kind of Work You Do (Did)?

Percent

	HEWG	WRT	SSRT	MANU	FINS	TCU	CONS	FFF	TOTAL
Good pay for what I do	33	28	25	33	25	33	50	20	30
Just about what it should be	45	41	49	36	50	50	30	60	44
A lot less than the job is worth	21	31	26	31	25	17	20	20	26
N=	102	81	79	58	28	12	10	5	(375)

Program participants tend to be almost evenly divided at the extreme ends of the wage scale dimension. A little more than a fourth believe the wage paid was either "good" for the work done or "a lot less" than the job was worth. The remainder, about one out of every four, believe they received a fair wage for their work. Those most enthusiastic about the pay they receive were in CONS--the same industry which generated the highest level of job satisfaction. At the same time, the wage factor does not appear to account for the lower degree of work satisfaction expressed by employees in TCU jobs. That group is most likely to indicate that they consider their pay to be satisfactory or good. A comparison of the responses to these two questions (wages and job satisfaction) suggests that both the actual wage received and assessment of the fairness of that wage for the job being done are factors at play when youth evaluate overall satisfaction with a job.

A question dealing with the "worthwhileness" of the job produces an overall distribution which resembles the findings on job satisfaction in that there were very few negative responses.

When you finish a days work, do (did) you feel like you did something worthwhile?

Percent

	HEWG	WRT	SSRT	MANU	FINS	TCU	CONS	FFF	TOTAL
Almost Always	68	56	39	52	64	67	50	40	56
Sometimes	30	37	44	41	32	25	50	60	37
Almost Never	2	7	17	7	4	8	--	--	7
N=	102	82	79	58	29	12	10	5	(376)

Whether they were talking about current employment or a most recent full time job, the majority of participants report a consistent feeling of having done a job which was worthwhile. That sense of value placed on the job was highest for those employed in HEWG (68%) and TCU (67%). As was the case in an examination of wages, value placed on the job does not help explain the low level of overall job satisfaction expressed by TCU youth employees. These data do show that the majority of youth employed in SSRT, although not overly critical about the equity of their wages and overall feelings about the work they do, seldomly feel that the work they do is worthwhile. Given the nature of many of the jobs that fall into the SSRT category, this finding should not be surprising. These are frequently the first full time jobs held by the youngest segment of the youth cohort. They are jobs which are held for a relatively short period of time, require minimal skills or credentials, and do not produce surprises for new entrants. They have a fairly clear picture of what the job entails as well as wages offered. There is little discrepancy between what is anticipated and what is found, hence, the lack of criticism over wages or job task. Evaluation of the value or worthwhileness of the job is, however, another matter.

A fourth question asked of program participants does deal with job expectations and job experiences.

If you knew then what you know now about this job--would you have taken the job?

Percent

	HEWG	WRT	SSRT	MANU	FINS	TCU	CONS	FFF	TOTAL
Yes, I would take the job again	75	74	74	74	89	50	100	80	75
I'm not too sure	14	13	16	20	11	25	--	20	16
No, not if I know what I know now	11	13	10	6	1	25	--	--	9
N=	102	82	79	58	28	12	10	5	(376)

Three out of every four participants indicate that even with additional job knowledge they would again take the same job. The reasons for that decision or the availability of options cannot be determined in this analysis. It should not be assumed that each participant had equal access to the same number or kinds of job opportunities. What can be concluded from these data is that the large majority or participating youth say that they are certain (75%) or somewhat certain (16%) that they would reapply for the same full-time job they hold or did hold prior to the time of the eight month follow up study. Further, with the exception of TCU jobs, only about one out of every ten participants say that they would not again take the same full-time job. Why TCU employment should account for the most critical assessments in overall job satisfaction as well as job reconsideration remains an unanswered question. Again, participants in TCU employment were not severe in their wage equity responses nor were they among those most negative in how they evaluated the "worthwhileness" of their jobs.

Regardless of organizational job setting and with the exception of TCU, the large majority take the position that new knowledge would not alter their initial job decision. Discounting those who are less than certain shows the same response rate for the four industrial organizations employing the major share of program participants. HEWG, WRT, SSRT, and MANU each have about 75% of current and former employees reporting that they are certain they would repeat their earlier job acceptance decision. These data would strongly indicate that few youth, employed at the entry level, experience serious discrepancies between what they expected of a job and what they actually found once they were on the job.

A final question asked of program participants focuses upon longer range career projections.

If you have your way, would you want to work for this place five years from now?

Percent

	HEWG	WRT	SSRT	MANU	FINS	TCU	CONS	FFF	TOTAL
Yes, I'm sure I would	34	21	21	40	25	33	40	40	29
I'm not sure	34	42	25	25	32	25	40	60	33
Definitely not	32	37	54	35	43	42	20	--	38
N =	102	80	78	57	28	12	10	5	(372)

Most participants express some degree of doubt as to whether they would choose to remain with their current employer five years from the time they participated in the eight month follow-up survey. The question, it should be kept in mind, does not deal with a specific job or career, but rather the "place" of employment. Those most certain that they would stay for the longer term are in MANU and CONS (both 40%). Conversely, those most definite in rejecting the idea of long term employment in the current work place are found in SSRT (54%) and TCU (42%). The doubters are fairly well evenly distributed.

Again, indications of job mobility and a lack of commitment to the current employer are to be expected with this youthful sample of entry level employees. Further, the desire or expectation to move on is greatest in precisely that industry which attracts the largest share of such youth and serves a major function as first job socializer--SSRT (54%).

In summarizing the data presented in this chapter, it seems prudent to remind the reader again that our concern here is with the experiences and evaluations of those who employ entry level youth workers. In this case redundancy should be tolerated since the point is of critical importance. Because the focus of the employer survey was on entry level jobs for youth, respondents did place a greater stress on attitudes, job behaviors, basic educational needs. Such might not be the case if the subject of concern had been the employment of adults, more mature youth, or entry into middle management and entrepreneurial functions. Recognizing the purpose of this study allows for a greater understanding of the data obtained in this inquiry. Given the developmental stage of the youthful subjects of this research and the nature of their first full-time job, the comments of employers make sense and

and should have been anticipated.

Knowing the context of this study should also allow for formulation of judgements as to the nature or tone of comments expressed by employer respondents. What may appear at first to be a highly critical or even harsh assessment of the young may in fact reflect understanding and some degree of sympathy. Comments about improper work attitudes or a lack of basic educational skills, or frequent job switching on the part of the young does of course represent a view held by many employer respondents. At the same time employers of these youth do recognize that these perceived shortcomings are not necessarily permanent nor totally the fault or responsibility of the young. They are behaviors and characteristics which are an annoyance and frequently an inconvenience to employers. Employers assume that high school graduation credentials should be hard evidence of at least rudimentary reading, writing, and arithmetic skills. Too often employers find that such is not the case and their criticism is directed as much, if not more so, to schools as to the young employee. Employers are confronted with serious work scheduling problems when employees are tardy or absent from the job. Still, they tend to recognize that youth, particularly those of poor economic status, are confronted with problems, (e.g., transportation, child care, illness, familial conflect), which prohibit compliance to a fixed time schedule. Employers say that youth are more likely to quit a job than be fired or laid off. Replacement of entry level workers is time consuming and expensive. Yet, the majority of employers indicate that in most cases those who voluntarily leave the job are seeking entrance to a better job. Employers also seem to understand that the adolescent stage of development is not characterized by stability or enduring commitment.

The comments and evaluations offered by respondents are no doubt an accurate reflection of employer experience with young entry level, low income youth. They should not be interpreted as being either cynical or hostile.

The data presented in this chapter also make clear that youth are not monolithic in their job related attitudes and expectations. Similarly, the industrial organizational work setting of young employees are not cut of a common cloth. Knowing more about the variations among youth and between different industrial organizations enables a more accurate understanding of the dynamics of work entry.

CHAPTER V: EMPLOYMENT AND GENERATIONAL DIFFERENCES

Employers were interviewed not only about the organization's experience with youth employees, but also about how employers compared younger and older workers.

A set of fourteen items in the Employer Interview were directed at learning more about how the interviewee, as either the owner, manager, or representative of the organization's personnel department, would compare older and younger workers. Fourteen different statements were made regarding the qualities of older and younger workers (e.g. "Older workers have worse attendance records than younger ones."). The employers were asked to tell the interviewer whether they agree or disagree with each comparison, or if they think that older and younger workers are the same. The interviewer then checked one of the three responses on the questionnaire.

The multiple choice responses (agree, disagree, same) were then analyzed in several different ways to determine whether there are differences between the opinions of employers based on (1) the industrial classification of the organization, (2) whether the organization is private or public, (3) the number of full-time employees, (4) the age composition of the on-site work force, (5) the sexual composition of the work force, and (6) the racial composition of the work force.* The industrial classification analysis is presented in this chapter as well as some discussion of attitude differences based on the age composition of organizations. No significant differences were found when there was control for sex and race composition of the work force or when comparisons were made between private and public organizations.

---

* (1) HEWG....CONS
  (2) % employees 16-21 years old
  (3) % male employees
  (4) % white employees

Quite a few of the responses given to the fourteen agree-disagree statements were significantly correlated with responses given for other statements (see Table V-2). All but two correlations were positive, meaning that the employers who responded favorably toward youth for one statement also supported youth in the other. Relationships were modest in size with the largest correlation being r = .40 between statements 13 and 14. The relationship between these two responses indicates that employers who feel that there is less risk in hiring older workers are also likely to agree with the statement, "All things being equal, any employer would prefer to hire older workers."

After responding to each statement, employers were asked to briefly explain why they feel the way they do about either generation of employees. Their explanations provide a wealth of additional insights about employer attitudes. Frequently the multiple choice responses could have been misinterpreted had it not been for the employer explanations of why they hold particular opinions regarding older and younger workers.

In this chapter, each of the fourteen comparison statements regarding older and younger workers is examined. For each comparison, the opinion held by the majority of employers is presented first. Each of the three opinions are discussed separately, including any differences between organizational types (Table V-1 serves as reference for this analysis).* Employers' explanations of their opinions are summarized so that the most prevalent comments made by employers are highlighted in this analysis.

---

*The Farming, Fishing, and Forestry category will be omitted from discussion due to the small number of employers interviewed.

TABLE V-1
RESPONSES TO STATEMENTS COMPARING OLDER AND YOUNGER WORKERS
(In Percentages)

	Total	Health, Ed., Legal Gov't, Welfare, Relig	Manufacture	Whole-Sale Retail	Trans. Commun. & Util	Services & Select. Retail	Finance Insur. & Select. Bus. Ser	Farming, Forestry & Fishing	Const
Older workers have worse attendance records than younger ones.									
Agree	4	4	6	3	5	5	1	0	2
Disagree	71	71	68	73	71	71	66	69	75
Same	25	25	27	24	24	24	32	31	23
Young workers usually arrive at work later than older ones.									
Agree	52	46	55	55	46	56	48	58	52
Disagree	16	20	12	13	19	14	13	8	26
Same	32	34	33	32	35	29	38	33	22
Young workers generally do better quality work than older ones.									
Agree	6	4	4	7	2	8	9	0	4
Disagree	49	54	41	47	53	47	40	61	65
Same	45	46	55	46	44	45	51	38	31
Older workers usually take longer to get their work done.									
Agree	17	18	14	18	21	16	9	31	14
Disagree	45	47	42	45	37	44	47	31	64
Same	38	34	43	36	42	40	44	38	22
Young workers show less initiative than older workers.									
Agree	33	28	32	40	26	35	22	31	37
Disagree	30	37	24	28	35	27	29	23	41
Same	37	35	44	32	39	38	48	46	22
Older workers are less adaptable to new problems.									
Agree	43	45	47	44	49	40	40	54	42
Disagree	29	31	23	28	23	31	26	15	36
Same	27	24	29	27	28	29	34	31	21
Older workers can communicate better.									
Agree	42	41	38	45	37	43	41	46	46
Disagree	20	21	16	22	16	18	21	8	17
Same	38	38	46	32	46	39	38	46	37
Young workers keep their jobs longer than older workers.									
Agree	4	3	6	3	9	4	3	8	10
Disagree	78	82	73	79	72	76	75	85	75
Same	18	14	20	18	19	20	22	8	15
Older workers have a better chance of being promoted.									
Agree	28	34	29	27	26	23	19	31	43
Disagree	31	34	32	27	37	30	35	46	22
Same	41	32	40	46	37	47	46	23	35
Young workers get worse performance evaluations.									
Agree	21	20	21	23	17	25	15	8	20
Disagree	33	40	27	29	38	28	35	33	39
Same	46	40	52	48	45	47	50	58	41
Young workers get along better with their coworkers.									
Agree	19	16	18	17	28	23	12	15	15
Disagree	23	29	16	21	21	21	25	23	27
Same	58	55	66	62	51	56	63	61	58
Young workers should receive preferential treatment in hiring & employment policies & practices.									
Agree	14	15	9	14	14	14	12	23	15
Disagree	58	61	54	59	46	56	65	61	63
Same	28	25	37	26	39	30	23	15	21
There is less risk in hiring older workers than there is hiring young workers.									
Agree	35	35	41	36	28	33	32	33	29
Disagree	27	29	16	25	28	29	31	17	41
Same	38	35	42	39	44	38	37	50	31
All things being equal, any employer would prefer to hire older workers.									
Agree	29	28	25	29	26	30	27	25	40
Disagree	42	45	43	40	37	42	39	42	40
Same	29	27	31	31	37	28	34	33	19
Range in sample size		339-347	168-173	235-238	42-43	378 384	67-68	12-*13	48-52

* Note the small sample size when interpreting results.

TABLE V-2

Intercorrelations Between Responses to Fourteen Employer Attitude Statements*

Statement No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	1.0	.22	.20	.15	.08	.09	NS	.23	NS	NS	.15	.12	.11	NS
2		1.0	NS	NS	.25	NS	.17	.11	.13	.26	NS	NS	.26	.19
3			1.0	.25	.13	.14	.08	.25	.09	NS	.21	.12	.10	.11
4				1.0	.07	.25	NS	.10	NS	NS	.26	.15	NS	NS
5					1.0	.07	.25	.10	.20	.35	NS	NS	.29	.25
6						1.0	NS	.07	NS	NS	.25	NS	NS	.10
7							1.0	.10	.21	.25	NS	NS	.27	.22
8								1.0	NS	.08	.14	.12	.11	NS
9									1.0	.33	NS	NS	.25	.32
10										1.0	NS	-.09	.38	.33
11											1.0	.11	NS	NS
12												1.0	NS	-.08
13													1.0	.40
14														1.0

* Responses were coded as follows:

(3) = Positive attitude toward youth
(2) = Neutral attitude toward youth
(1) = Negative attitude toward youth

Statement #1: "Older workers have worse attendance records than younger ones."

Almost three-quarters (71%) of the employers disagree with this statement. Although there is little difference in the percent of disagreement reported by the employers in the various organizational categories, employers in CONS show the most disagreement with this statement. It is interesting to note that construction organizations employ a relatively small percentage of youth.

Many of the employers who disagree describe older workers as more "reliable," "responsible," "dependable," or used similar terms such as "dedicated," "conscientious," "loyal," or "committed." Older workers are characterized as being better trained in work habits and more committed to the work ethic as follows:

> "Older workers grew up when working was more important."
>
> "Youth are not industrially disciplined."
>
> "Youth will work two or three weeks steadily and then stop showing up."
>
> "They (older workers) take their jobs and their responsibilities more seriously."
>
> "You can rely on them every day."
>
> "Young people do not have the work ethic often associated with the depression era older workers."
>
> "Young workers are goalless." "Priorities are not right yet."

The need for job security of older workers is also cited as a reason for their better attendance records:

> "Older workers have responsibilities and have to show up because they need the job more."
>
> "Young ones are not dependent on their paycheck for self support and usually fun preceeds work."

> "Older workers have a more immediate and necessary economic need."

Older workers are judged to be more "settled," "stable," and "mature," as reflected by remarks such as, "Older workers are more aware of what they want out of life. With maturity comes a stronger sense of responsibility which influences their overall attitude toward work."

Some employers feel that older workers have better control of their personal lives and access to more reliable transportation. One employer commented, "Work is not number one priority to some youth. They are absent because of domestic, child care, and transportation problems."

Another opinion held by some employers who disagree is that younger workers are frequently in low level, menial jobs and therefore have less incentive to develop good attendance records. The comments below support this belief:

> "Young usually have worse records, but it probably has more to do with job level than age level."
>
> "The only serious attendance problems are at low level, minimum wage labor positions which are mostly youth."

A very small percentage of the employers (4%) agree with the statement that "older workers have worse attendance records than younger ones." Their comments in support of younger workers include the following:

> "Health problems keep older workers out more, and they know how to play the sick leave game."
>
> "As heads of households, older workers have family problems that keep them out."
>
> "Young workers need the job more. They are likely to be participating in their first job. Older workers tend not to be as concerned."
>
> "Young workers (16-21) have had excellent attendance."
>
> "Young workers on probation are better."

One-quarter of the employers (25%) indicate that older and younger employees have similar attendance records. The FINS category has the largest proportion of employers who feel this way, perhaps because these organizations employ small numbers of youth and are quite selective in hiring practices.

Some employers who say that there is little or no difference between the attendance records of younger and older workers believe this is so because poor attendance frequently leads to penalties or possible dismissal. These respondents say:

> "Absences are not tolerated."
>
> "Workers with previous attendance problems are not kept on."
>
> "No attendance problem--it would come out of their pay."

Other comments from those who responded "same" are as follows:

> "Attendance varies with the individual and type of job."
>
> "Both (age groups) use legitimate reasons not to attend work."
>
> "Attendance record is a personal problem more than a structural group problem."

Statement #2: "Young workers usually arrive at work later than older ones."

More than half (52%) of the employers believe that younger workers are more often tardier than older workers and hence, agree with this statement. Expressions of agreement are most likely to come from employers in the SSRT, WRT, and MANU categories. Although large numbers of youth are employed by both SSRT and WRT organizations, MANU organizations employ relatively few young workers. Greater tardiness among youth in those three organizations may be partially due to their adherence to time clocks and scheduling of shifts. In other words, these employers may be more "time conscious" and hence, more aware of promptness among employees.

Many of the comments made by those who agree with this statement are similar to those made by employers who considered youth to have worse attendance records. Youth are characterized as lacking "responsibility" and having "poor attitudes." Frequent comments included:

> "Most all young people have pretty irresponsible attitudes."
>
> "The young do not really care."
>
> "They do not have enough concern."
>
> "Youth have not developed the right attitude yet or respect for the job."
>
> "Lack of discipline--do not take job seriously."

Once again, the poor work habits of youth are commented upon as follows:

> "Young do not know what is required in a job and that being on time is important."
>
> "They have no self discipline."
>
> "Young have not developed regular work habits."
>
> "They seem to be lazy and wait until the last minute to do anything."

One manager thought that youth have problems with tardiness due to "improper planning and use of time." Older workers were considered to be "more conscious of time." Some employers note that with on-the-job experience "the problem of tardiness is worked with--often successfully."

Older workers are viewed as having family obligations that necessitate good work habits. On the other hand, youth are seen as having more "outside pressures such as domestic problems, transportation, etc." Social activities are also reported to interfere with prompt arrival at work. Typical remarks are:

> "Because they are out partying the night before and cannot get up."
>
> "Young workers have so many activities going on in their lives."

Of interest is a small group of employers who agree that younger workers arrive at work later than older workers, but who make the point that the youth are not tardy. These employers report that younger workers are on board when "the whistle blows;" they just do not arrive as early as older employees. One employer made the point: "Young workers are right on time. Older workers come early." Another manager believes that "They (youth) do not feel it's necessary to come early."

Some 16% of the employers disagree with the statement that young workers arrive at work late. The CONS, HEWG, and TCU classifications of organizations show the strongest disagreement with this statement. Some employers indicate that although youth arrive at work late, employers could not call them tardy due to flexible hour plans:

> "This does not apply to our employees because their working hours are flexible."
>
> "Flexible hours offer discretion to workers, but younger workers have a lifestyle that seems to make them arrive later."

Other comments laud youth for their promptness:

> "Youth tend to arrive earlier because they are more enthusiastic."
>
> "They are eager about learning the job."
>
> "Our young workers have been very time conscious."

Nearly one-third (32%) of the respondents see no difference in tardiness which could be attributed to the age of the employee. As with the attendance issue, FINS organizations were the most inclined to say that younger and older employees are the same in promptness. From the following comments of employers who responded "same" to this item, it appears that this group is composed of employers with three different perspectives: 1. No one is late, 2. Only certain employees are late, and 3. Lateness is a problem among most employees.

1. "Being late would not be tolerated."

   "Everyone gets here at the same time because they are paid by the hour and must sign in."

   "Young and old arrive a few minutes early."

   "If that is a problem the worker is terminated, young or old."

2. "Based on supervision, not age."

   "Depends on the individual and circumstances."

   "Cannot generalize."

3. "Overall problem with everyone."

   "Traffic problems are popular excuses."

Statement #3: "Young workers generally do better quality work than older ones."

Almost half (49%) of the employers disagree with this statement. Those in CONS, TCU, and HEWG show even larger percentages of disagreement. This finding may, in part, explain why those organizations employ few youth.

Employers who support older workers again fault youth for having poor attitudes and lacking motivation to work. Remarks such as the following are made:

> "Young workers are more impatient, therefore quality of work is less than that of older workers."
>
> "Young workers of today are sloppy. The older ones have more of a sense of pride."
>
> "Lack of care. Attitude seems to be one of 'I do not need your job'."
>
> "They (youth) do not show the interest and enthusiasm older workers do."

These employers favor older workers because "Older workers do better quality (work)--they bring better performance standards to the job." Employers also indicate that youth are inexperienced and should receive more training, especially for technical jobs. They disagree with the statement that younger workers produce better quality work with comments such as the following:

> "Definitely not, they do not have the experience."
>
> "Quality is based on experience more than age."
>
> "Young workers are not well prepared to perform their jobs well."

Very few of the respondents (6%) agree with this statement about younger workers. Not surprisingly, many of the employers who believe that youth do perform superior quality work are from SSRT and WRT organizations which employ high percentages of youth. A small but significant correlation exists between the percentages of 16-21 year old youth that the organization employs and the conviction that younger employees do better quality work (r= .10). However, it is curious that the FINS category reported the highest percentage of agreement since organizations in that category underemploy youth. The comments of this group of employers contradict those made by employers who feel that youth have poor attitudes and lack motivation. In fact, their remarks represent a wholehearted endorsement of young workers.

> "They (youth) are excited about the challenge of learning and advancing in their jobs."
>
> "It's usually their first jobs. They try hard to impress their supervisors in how well they can perform."
>
> "Young workers are more enthusiastic, more concerned with details, and more concerned with losing their jobs."
>
> "Young people are more open to change; old people are set in their ways."
>
> "Youth are trying to get ahead. When people are at a job too long, their quality of work is not as good."

Again, the factor of employee selectivity does no doubt play an important part in the more favorable responses of FINS employers. Some of the employers believe that youth have mental and physical qualities that enhance the quality of their work:

> "Young workers tend to be more innovative as well as creative."
>
> "They have more energy and physical productivity."

Other employers qualify their support of youth by saying that it depends on which job they are doing:

> "Youth often take more time and care, especially in this department."
>
> "Youth perform better in the positions we put them in."

A large percentage (45%) of the employers feel that older and younger workers do the same quality of work. Employers from MANU and FINS are most inclined to rate older and younger workers as similar with regard to the quality of their work. It may be that these organizations have strict quality control procedures and would not retain employees who do not meet standards, regardless of their age. For example, one comment was, "Everything is so regulated it's hard to find varying levels of quality."

Many employers note that a comparison between age groups is not possible because work quality "depends on the individual and the job which has to be done." Others remark that the individual's attitude and training would have to be taken into account in order to make such a statement:

> "They are the same, once they are trained."
>
> "It depends on the interest, initiative, dedication, etc."

Some employers note negative qualities in both age groups which they believe balance out generational differences. One comment is, "Young workers take a while to get adjusted to the job; older workers who remain for a long time become complacent." Other employers believe that both groups have valuable qualities and that a mix of younger and older workers is desirable.

92

These employers state that "usually a combination of older and younger (workers) results in the best campaign," and "they all work together so they have to keep the quality up."

Statement #4: "Older workers usually take longer to get their work done."

Most employers (45%) again demonstrate their support for older workers by disagreeing with this statement. Respondents from the CONS industrial category report the highest level of disagreement (64%). It seems that the loss in physical speed which comes with age is compensated for with the older worker's technical expertise. In fact, the comments made most often by those who thought older employees work faster attribute this to the greater experience of older employees. Familiarity with their jobs and with the working environment are credited for the timely accomplishments of older employees.

> "Work is usually completed by older workers in a short period of time because of knowledge and experience."
>
> "Older workers have more job related experience and know the ropes."
>
> "Young workers are slow because they lack experience."

Many of the employers feel that older workers tend to be "more organized" and "use their time more wisely." Comments regarding time management are typical:

> "Young workers do not know how to pace themselves. They do not know how to discriminate between productive and nonproductive tasks."
>
> "Older workers try to finish their work right away. Youth do not understand the importance of time--they are too busy talking to each other."
>
> "Younger workers are distracted a lot easier."
>
> "Older workers tend to business--not as much horseplay."

Again, as with earlier comparisons, there are those who qualified their support for older workers by commenting that individual differences must be taken into account:

> "It depends on the individual, the job, and work habits."

Some 17% of the interviewees agree that older workers take more time to get their work done. All industrial categories report similar levels of agreement except FINS which registers only nine percent (9%). It is not surprising that FINS would be reluctant to agree in that these organizations employ high percentages of older workers. However, most of the employers who agree with this statement are not necessarily criticizing older employees; they feel that the extra time is usually well spent improving the quality of products or services. Older workers are described as more thorough, conscientious, and attentive to details. Speed was not appreciated by these who comment that older workers take "pride" in their work:

> "They (older workers) may take a few minutes more, but they are thorough."
>
> "Older workers take longer but provide better work."
>
> "They are a little slower, but more careful."
>
> "They take their time and do it right the first time."
>
> "Younger employees tend to rush through things."
>
> "Younger workers do not have the patience in certain jobs."

In contrast, there are some jobs in which speed is appreciated. Older workers are described as less energetic and younger workers are preferred for manual labor, assembly line jobs, and fast food service. In addition, relatively large percentages of employers in TCU agree that older workers take longer, perhaps due to the fact that these occupations necessitate physical speed and strength (e.g., trucking, shipping, etc.)

A little over a third (37%) of the employers feel that older and younger workers take about the same amount of time to complete their work. Some of them make it clear that it "depends on the individual" or that it "depends on the job."

Other comments give the impression that variances in speed are either uncommon or are not tolerated. This may explain why such large percentages of FINS, MANU, and TCU employers judged their workers to be the same in speed; that is, co-workers or supervisors pressure employees to adhere to a rigid production schedule.

> "They are about the same if they have been trained well."
>
> "Each person works at his or her own pace. If they work too slow they get fired."
>
> "Production line paces the work rate."
>
> "Work is systematic. The slow are weeded out, the fast paced, and the poor workers let go."

Statement #5: "Young workers show less initiative than older workers."

Responses to this statement are closely divided among the three options although the same option was chosen by the highest percentage (37%) of employers. Those in FINS and MANU were most inclined to say that worker initiative is similar across age groups. From the remarks that are made it seems that these employers believe that individual attributes or the nature of a particular job affect worker initiative rather than age:

> "Initiative is related to work attitudes and interesting jobs."
>
> "Individual's character is the deciding factor, not age."
>
> "Usually there is not much space for initiative--they are told what to do."
>
> "In this business they all seem to lack initiative."

Thirty-three (33%) percent of the respondents agree with the statement that young workers do not have as much initiative as their older co-workers. Interestingly, relatively high percentages of agreement are reported by WRT and SSRT organizations, both of which tend to employ large numbers of youth. It is reasonable to assume that the types of jobs held by youth in these organizations (i.e., sales clerk, gas station attendant, fast food service worker) either require little initiative or offer little latitude for initiative on the part of youth employees. Youth may view these jobs as short term, gap fillers which provide little reward for initiative, as indicated by the following comments:

> "They lose eagerness fast; this job has no advancement."
>
> "Ninety percent of the youth see this job as something to get them through school."
>
> "They are here only for the money, and the wage is low."

Many employers point out that young workers require close supervision. Employers say that without supervision youth would not complete assigned tasks and that they rarely take the initiative for additional work. Typical remarks are:

> "The younger worker has to be told what to do."
>
> "They need constant supervision as basic as being told to turn on the machine."
>
> "I am more likely to have to remind a young person to do a task."
>
> "Most youth do not ask for extra work when their job is done."

Some managers report that young employees have limited work experience and therefore feel too unsure of themselves to display any initiative. As one employer says, "They (youth) are not used to the work environment and do not understand what is expected of them. They do not realize that they can take on other responsibilities or seek additional work." Other comments of this nature are:

> "They (youth) have a more limited view of the job."
>
> "Their lack of initiative is often caused by not really knowing what to do."
>
> "They feel less confident and less competent."
>
> "Young workers are not sure of themselves. They hold back--do not want to make mistakes."

Other employers who agree with this statement comment on attitudinal characteristics of youth. They make comments such as the following:

> "Youth have poor attitudes--do not care about the job--just some pocket money."
>
> "Younger ones have a 'this is not my job' concept."
>
> "Young people are generally not as interested in their work."

Employers who disagree that "young workers show less initiative" represent 30% of the respondents. Relatively high percentages of disagreement are reported by organizations in the CONS, HEWG, and TCU categories. Since these organizations are not major employers of youth, it may be that the relatively few youth they do employ are a select group who demonstrate exceptional initiative. Many employers who feel that young workers show initiative describe them as eager, creative, and energetic.

> "They are innovative, ingenious and a source of good ideas."
>
> "Young workers are more anxious to learn, especially when given more responsibility."
>
> "Young workers are quicker to try new ideas and approaches."
>
> "Young people seem to take more action; older people play it safe."
>
> "Young workers usually show more imagination and creativity."
>
> "Young workers are inspired by their peers."

Some employers attribute youth with having more initiative due to the fact that they are trying harder than older employees to receive a good performance appraisal:

> "Young workers are aggressive and are striving to get ahead."

> "They show more initiative due to their eagerness to impress and show that they care about the job. Older ones adapt a tenure attitude."

> "Sometimes they show more because it is their first job and they want to make a good impression."

> "Young consider going into a career. They have more job opportunities and are interested in their future."

> "Young want to get ahead; they are not satisfied with being in one specific job."

Other comments made by those who disagree are not necessarily in favor of young workers, but imply that the employer controls how much initiative may be shown:

> "Performance and expectation are covered when employed. They know what to do."

> "Work is conducted on an incentive basis so that the more work, the more money."

Based upon what other investigators have found, it would seem safe to conclude that job performance and productivity may have less to do with age than the nature and conditions of the job. The more interesting, challenging, and rewarding the work task, the more likely it is that the employee will exhibit behaviors of commitment, loyalty, initiative, and efficiency.

Statement #6: "Older workers are less adaptable to new problems."

More than two-fifths (43%) of the employers agree that "older workers are less adaptable to new problems." Large differences among the various types of organizations are not apparent for those who agree with this item.

However, it is interesting that so many employers from typically older worker organizations (e.g., TCU and MANU organizations) agree with the statement. This may simply be due to the fact that older workers retain their jobs even though management sees them as somewhat less adaptable than younger workers.

Employers say, "They (older workers) do not want to try new ideas," and "We like to hire youth for their versatility." Some employers feel that the inflexibility of older workers is primarily due to habits which they have developed over the years and are not willing to abandon:

> "Older workers do not usually keep an open mind."
>
> "The young grasp new ideas readily whereas older workers get rather set in their ways. Old habits are hard to break."
>
> "Older workers will generally develop a system and stay with it."
>
> "Younger, inexperienced workers sometimes use more creative approaches."

Other employers think that resistance to change is the product of the older worker's conscious decision to adhere to long established procedures:

> "Less likely to change from a proven method."
>
> "They have been around longer and feel they know the right way to do things."
>
> "Older workers have had longer to develop opinions and attitudes, thus they are more set in them."

About one-third (29%) of the employers disagree with the statement that "older workers are less adaptable to new problems." Employers from CONS organzations, which employ particularly large percentages of 30-49 year olds, disagree more frequently than employers in the other industrial categories. Many respondents believe that the broader experiences of older workers allow them to adapt as well as, and better than, younger workers. The following quotes are illustrative of the group who feel that older workers are able to "meet new challenges head on."

> "Older workers adapt to problems better. They take things in stride."
>
> "They adapt somewhat better because they have more extensive experience."
>
> "Older workers generally have more experience and can handle problems better."
>
> "Older workers have more problems solving expertise/experience."

The remaining 27% of the interviewees reported that younger and older workers adapt to new problems in a similar manner. Employers representing FINS organizations most often report no differences in the adaptability of the two age groups. A similarity in the ability to adapt is explained by some employers to mean that "both young and old employees have problems." Others remark that "some people can work around a problem while others cannot." Age is frequently reported not to be a determining factor, while the type of job often is--"Depends on the problem not on age." A few employers explain that "everyone must be adaptable; that is what they are paid for."

Statement #7: "Older workers can communicate better."

Employers are nearly evenly split between "agree" (42%) and "same" (38%) responses to this statement. There are only small variations in the percentage of agreement by industrial category. Older workers are credited with "knowing how to express themselves" and with being "more apt to discuss a problem." One respondent points out that older workers: "can explain things better and are better able to follow directions." Another reports that older workers, "realize that to get the job done, it's necessary to communicate." It is apparent from the following remarks that some employers value older staff for their ability to interact with the public:

> "Older workers are more patient and friendly to customers."
>
> "Older employees communicate better with customers."
>
> "They usually understand clients and the nature of a particular job a little quicker."

Frequent comments indicate that older workers communicate better due to their general experience or the fact that their human relations skills are called upon more often.

> "Maturity makes them confident."
>
> "Skills in communication are learned with experience and age."
>
> "They articulate better because of experience."

Others attribute communication skills to technical or educational experience:

> "Today schools are not preparing youth properly."
>
> "Older workers have a better education in communication skills."
>
> "There is a definite dialect difference; speech patterns are different."
>
> "Young workers have not learned to modify their speech patterns."
>
> "Older workers are superior, especially in written communication."
>
> "Older workers have more knowledge, more patience, and have a clearer idea about what they do."
>
> "They communicate better from a technical standpoint because older workers know more."
>
> "Older workers understand the jargon of the profession better."

Some employers criticize the communications skills or behaviors of youth. They say that "young persons face this (poor communications skills) as a major problem on the job." Other remarks are:

> "It's hard to communicate with young people. They do not really listen and think they know it all."
>
> "They shocked the staff with their 'earthy' street language."

> "They do not take the time to communicate with others."
>
> "Youth consider older people parent figures which sets up a communication barrier."

As mentioned earlier, nearly as many employers respond "same" to this comparison. There are only slight variations in the level of response by industrial category. TCU employers are particularly inclined to report a high level of similarity between the communication skills of older and younger workers (46%). Perhaps this is because TCU employers seek to hire only individuals with acceptable communication skills. Many of the TCU employers believe that all of their employees communicate well:

> "Everybody is pretty communicative in this field or they do not last."
>
> "They all communicate intelligently."
>
> "Workers in general communicate very well."
>
> "All workers have to communicate in this business."
>
> "All communicate when given the opportunity."
>
> "Both are capable of communicating when they want to."

Other employers feel that individual differences rather than age group membership are the critical determinants of communication skills:

> "Both age groups have people who excell in this."
>
> "Depends on the individual."
>
> "Age is not a factor. It depends on the person's interest and individual attitude."
>
> "Older workers communicate better with older people and young people communicate better with young people. Depends on the group the older worker is dealing with."

One-fifth (20%) of those who responded to this statement disagree that older workers are better communicators. Among these employers, older workers are not perceived as having a better rapport with customers.

Youth are said to communicate better because they are more vocal, less inhibited, and more sociable than older workers:

> "They (youth) converse well, especially with the public, and are more lively."
>
> "They are less inhibited and therefore tend to be more open."
>
> "Younger workers are generally more expressive."
>
> "A youth will speak out more freely than older workers."
>
> "Young workers are more outgoing and looser."

It should be noted that many of those who disagree do not mean to imply that young workers communicate better than older workers. Their comments indicate that either they view the two age groups as the same or they do not see differences linked to age.

> "They generally communicate equally."
>
> "Both age groups communicate about the same."
>
> "It varies from individual to individual."
>
> "It depends on the worker's personality."
>
> "It depends on the background."

Statement #8: "Young workers keep their jobs longer than older workers."

This statement provokes the largest disagreement of all--78%. This is not really surprising given the developmental stage and mobility of entry level workers as well as the benefits and entitlements accrued to older workers. There is very little variation in the level of disagreement by industrial category. Employers in HEWG report the largest disagreement, perhaps because younger workers most frequently enter these organizations on a short-term basis as interns, aids, or clerical workers. Even organizations which are major employers (WRT and SSRT) report high percentages of disagreement. WRT and SSRT employers, because of the types of jobs they offer and the wages they pay, are unable to compete for older workers. Further, they do not really expect youthful workers to remain in the entry level positions for other than short periods of time.

Employers' comments are varied. They note that youth "have a tendancy to job hop" and that the "turnover rate is higher among youth." Many employers say that young employees "tend to move from job to job" because they are sampling different types of work to see what they enjoy or what they would like to pursue as a career:

> "Young workers are searching at this time in their lives which is entirely right and necessary."
>
> "They (youth) are undecided about the type of work and, therefore change jobs more readily."
>
> "They are experimenting to find out what they want in life."
>
> "In searching for their niche, they move around a lot."
>
> "Young workers are generally experimenting in the beginning."
>
> "Young workers will usually learn the job and move on to another job."

Other employers attribute job changing to youth's determination for self improvement rather than experimentation. Their comments are as follows:

> "Young workers look for advancement opportunities. Older workers look for security."
>
> "Younger workers are always looking for promotions. Youth are more mobile and will go where promotions are available."
>
> "Youth are more upwardly mobile and they generally have fewer family responsibilities."
>
> "They get too good for the job and go on to better responsibilities."

Some respondents point out that youth are normally only looking for short-term employment as a filler between school terms. "Most employees 16-21 are not working here for a career but to earn extra money for educational purposes." Other remarks are:

> "Young workers generally go back to school or other activities."
>
> "Young workers usually move along. They work here after school for extra money."

Other personal reasons for frequent job changes are family relocation and marriage. Employers remark that youth "tend to move or get married."

Many respondents note that long term commitments are not expected for the types of jobs for which youth are frequently hired.

> "Young workers keep their jobs for a shorter period of time because the type of work they perform is generally maintenance or temporary."
>
> "Older employees tend to stay on a job longer. Young people come in at entry level and may not see any opportunities for advancement."
>
> "These are temporary jobs for youth, but they would stay on permanent type jobs."

Most of these comments indicate the employers consider the higher turnover rate among young employees as both predictable and understandable. Others see the high turnover rate as expected, given the type of jobs that youth are offered. The next group of comments are from employers who feel that youth change jobs frequently without good reason. These employers feel that youth are "not responsible," are "too immature," and are "interested only in making spending money."

> "Young workers get bored and leave; they show less responsibility."
>
> "Youth have less tolerance, have not developed steady work habits, are not steady workers on a day-to-day basis, don't think ahead, are spur of the moment. Older workers have more ability to reason about situations; they're more consistent, mature, and stable."
>
> "Young people don't like to be hassled. Their attitudes are different."

"They're not interested in working and less serious about work."

"Just quit for some foolish reason."

Finally, the other type of comment made by employers who disagree with this statement focuses on older workers. Older workers are said to be "more dedicated" to their jobs and are less likely to take risks in transferring because they have a strong need for security. Because of their responsibilities, older workers are said to be more reluctant to go out looking for a job. Comments regarding the higher retention rate of older workers include the following:

"Most older workers are looking for security; youth are not."

"Older workers seem to be more stable and secure."

"Older workers are settled down more and have more responsibilities."

"Older workers are more cautious about holding onto jobs. Kids are not concerned about consequences of leaving a job."

"Older workers are more concerned about staying on jobs for benefits."

Only 4% of the respondents agree that "younger workers keep their jobs longer than older workers." Some of these employers commented about older workers. They believe that because of their work experience and skills, older workers are more mobile in the job market. For example:

"Experienced older workers are in demand and switch jobs often."

"Younger workers stay here longer. Older workers have experience and can get better jobs."

"Higher turnover among slightly older, experienced workers due to shortage of talent."

Other remarks made by those in agreement with this statement are:

"Turnover rate is lower among youth who are usually students and are not out looking for regular jobs."

"Holding a job helps youth prepare for later jobs after graduation. This is why they hold on."

"In this program the younger workers seem to enjoy work better."

Eighteen percent (18%) of the interviewees believe that age does not make a difference and that length of time on the job depends on the individual's preferences:

"Depends on the worker."

"If they like their work, they will stay."

"I see no difference in this area."

"Length of stay is about the same."

"Young workers are not commited and older workers get bored."

Statement #9: "Older workers have a better chance of being promoted."

In response to this statement, 41% of the employers report that older and younger workers have the same chances of being promoted. SSRT, WRT, and FINS employers are particularly supportive of this opinion. These employers believe that promotions are awarded on the basis of "merit," "performance," "ability" and "skill." Promotions are thought to be the product of an egalitarian process in which everyone has the same chance. Employers say, "The best get promoted regardless of age." Other remarks are:

"Their chances are equal if all are working as well as they can."

"All workers move up on merit only--strictly merit."

"Performance and quality of work determine promotion."

"If they do the work, both have equal chances."

Other employers acknowledge seniority as a contributing factor of promotional decisions. However, seniority is not considered to be the only reason for promotion:

"Length of time with the company and work quality, not age, are the reasons for raises."

"Length of time on job and attitude count for all."

"Merit and time employed."

A few employers remarked that "there's little room for promotion here," for any worker regardless of age. A few other respondents note that promotions are predictable for both age groups.

"All promotions are the same with union labor. The only difference is supervisory capacity."

"Raises occur at time intervals, not merit based."

Thirty-one percent (31%) of the respondents disagree with the statement that "older workers have a better chance of being promoted." Some of the employers who choose to disagree make remarks like those of the employers who reported a similarity of promotional policies for all workers. The chance for promotion is once again reported to be based on "performance," "merit" or on a system (i.e., union or civil service) that does not take age into consideration.

"Promotions are based on initiative, drive, and willingness to improve operations."

"All good workers, regardless of age, deserve promotions when due."

"Capabilities determine how far you go."

"Based on civil service test."

"Because of the union, it's the same for all."

Many employers believe that younger workers have greater upward mobility due to their initiative and society's orientation toward youth. Typical comments are:

"People view youth as more mobile."

"Younger workers have a better chance to move up, more room for advancement."

"Young workers tend to have more initiative, move up faster."

"Young workers ask and try for promotions which older ones don't."

"Youth is an important factor in the retail area."

Many respondents view older workers as being at a disadvantage because they have less upward mobility than entry level younger employees. Those who have not been promoted are assessed as being either incompetent or uninterested in moving up.

"Some are not even interested in being promoted."

"Older workers have risen among the ranks."

"Most older workers are on the only job they can do."

"Youth are preferred because they may be groomed by an organization."

"Youth have better career potentials."

Twenty-eight percent (28%) of the respondents agree that older workers have an advantage over youth in promotions. Many of those who agree state that promotion policy "depends on seniority only." Perhaps this explains why particularly large percentages of agreement are reported by CONS and HEWG employers; construction jobs tend to be unionized and government jobs based on civil service status. In both cases seniority is an important criterion in the promotion process, as the following two statements attest:

"Yes, raises are given based on length of employment."

"Promotions are due to experience and length of time with company."

Other employers highlight the experiences, knowledge, and abilities of older workers as the primary reasons that they are more likely to be promoted. Remarks like the following are common:

"People are promoted because of knowledge and understanding of the job. Experience is a prerequisite to promotion in this industry."

"Older workers have more confidence in their abilities."

"You're promoted for what you know, therefore older workers have a better chance."

Some of those who agree explain that because of work experience, the nature of jobs held by youth and older workers are frequently dissimilar. They say:

> "Older workers are regular staff and their training, qualifications, and length of service lead to promotion and raises."
>
> "Older workers tend to be in promotable positions."
>
> "There are plenty of people to fill entry level, but we want to hold on to upper level."
>
> "Due to differing jobs, the young cannot be promoted."

Once again, older workers are praised for their "maturity," "dependability," and "sustained job performance." A frequent observation is that they "stay around long enough to do the job." Employers feel that older workers "can generally accept responsibility" and some employers remarked that they were "reluctant to give responsibilities to youth." One interviewee noted, "Older workers get more respect from younger workers than vice-versa."

Statement #10: "Young workers get worse performance evaluations."

Again, as with the preceeding promotion issue, the largest group of employers respond "same" to this statement. Almost half (46%) of them believe the two age groups earn similar performance evaluation ratings. A significant number of respondents explain that the job does not allow for much variance in performance:

> "All about the same. Everything's pretty well mechanized, hard to have varying levels of quality."
>
> "Both (young and older workers) do the same quality work when performing the same jobs."

Other employers simply note that evaluations are based on individual performance or merit, and not on age. These respondents say:

"It all depends on the person regardless of age."

"Based on a person's quality of work; not age."

Remarks about employee performance indicate that young and old alike are expected to meet the same standards:

"Work standards are the same for all."

"They have to meet skills standards."

Exactly one-third (33%) of the employers disagree that "young workers get worse performance evaluations." Employers from HEWG, CONS, and TCU organizations show the highest percentages of disagreement. This is interesting in that organizations in these industrial categories tend to underemploy youth, yet they are seemingly in support of the performance of those youth they do hire. Many of them make positive observations about the performance of younger workers such as the following:

"Lately the younger ones are doing better."

"Young workers are as capable of doing the job as well as anyone else."

"Youth work harder."

"Younger workers are better because of their speed."

"Some perform exceptionally well."

"They do fantastic jobs."

Other employers commend youth for their positive attitudes. The following remarks are typical:

"Young workers try harder to make an impression, usually its their first job."

"Young workers are more eager and enthusiastic."

"Youth care about their work."

"Young workers want to do a better job."

"Youth are more concerned about their work records."

A great number of those employers who disagree with this item emphasize that evaluations are not age-related and "all workers are treated equally." Some note that performance evaluations are merit-based according to the individual's performance. Others mention personal characteristics which affect employee evaluations. Comments made by this group of employers may be categorized with those who responded same:

> "Based on my experience, age seems to make little difference."
>
> "We acknowledge any good job. If an employee works hard, we recognize it."
>
> "Evaluation is based on the individual's experience, attitude, and character--not age."
>
> "Other than attendance, younger workers on the average are comparable to older workers."

Although only 21% of the employers agree that younger workers get worse performance evaluations, they tend to be outspoken in their criticism of younger workers. It is interesting to note that SSRT and WRT organizations register the largest percentage of agreement, given that they are major employers of youth. Youth are criticized for their poor attitudes and lack of pride and commitment as follows:

> "Attitude is deplorable."
>
> "Young workers are not as conscientious."
>
> "Young workers don't take pride in their work."
>
> "Young workers tend to walk away from the job quicker than older workers."
>
> "Overall, youth want to get places fast and do other things, and don't want to work at their jobs, just put in time."

Some employers say that youth are frequently "late or don't show." These managers view youth as less "responsible" and less "stable," which some attribute to the fact that they are "less family oriented." Others note that youth need to be prodded to perform their duties. They say that youth "always have to be told what to do," and that youth have "no initiative."

Other employers do not criticize youth, but report that they receive worse performance evaluations because they have not had as much work experience as older employees. Insufficient experience is not believed to be a fault of youth, but rather due to the fact that they need more time. These managers say that "it takes time to get a job under control," and youth probably get worse evaluations because of inexperience in the work world." Several respondents noted their empathy for youth by adding comments such as:

> "Management is less fair with young employees."
>
> "Employers are harsher on youth."
>
> "Supervisors are apt to be more forgiving with older workers."

Statement #11: "Young workers get along better with their co-workers."

Overall, more than half (58%) of the employers respond same to this comparison. The majority of employers in every industrial category believe that younger and older employee co-worker relations are about the same. Numerous employers offer comments which suggest that employee relations are excellent and the organization's intent is "to hire personable, friendly people." This desire is reflected in the following remarks:

> "We have quite a mixture and everyone gets along. The older workers enjoy the younger ones."
>
> "We have good personalities here."
>
> "Young and old get along, no problems."
>
> "We have a great understanding among the group."

On the other hand, a few employers like the following suggest that they've had problems with both age groups:

"They all have a hard time until they know everyone."

"Conflicts occur among all age groups."

"They all have their ups and downs."

"There are cliques according to age group; the young with their own age, the older with theirs."

As with previous comparison statements, many employers say that there are no differences based upon age:

"It depends on the individual."

"It depends on who they are working with."

Responses are almost evenly divided between those who disagree (23%) and those who agree (19%) that young workers get along better with co-workers. Employers who disagree with the statement make comments similar to the following which are unfavorable toward youth. Employers either laud older workers for their interpersonal skills or criticize youth for their lack of them.

"Older workers usually get along better."

"Older workers develop relationships. Youth aren't here long enough to get comfortable with co-workers."

"A lot of young workers don't know how to interact. We have to guide, counsel, point out that what they perceive is not necessarily true."

"Young workers don't try to get along with co-workers."

"Youth lack socialization skills appropriate to a work environment."

Some employers make specific criticisms of youth and report that young workers exhibit immaturity, jealousy, inflexibility, and resentfulness on the job. They also say that youth are more "competitive," "assertive" and "argumentative." Typical comments are:

"Constant bickering and jealousy is a continual problem here."

"Jealousy is a large problem in entry level jobs."

"Youth are much worse. They resent direction from peers and staff."

"Some have a rebel attitude and challenge everything."

"Youth don't want to conform with the requirements imposed upon them."

"There's more competition between workers on their own level."

Some employers disagree that youth have better relationships because they see no difference in social skills between age groups. They make remarks such as:

"Age has no bearing on how you get along."

"It has nothing to do with compatability or disposition."

"Age is not a factor, personality is."

Others stress their desire for employees to get along together, skirting the issue of whether or not they actually do:

"We all have to work together."

"This employer strives for all workers to cooperate, regardless of age."

Nineteen percent (19%) of the respondents agree that "younger workers get along better with their co-workers." In general, employers who agree tend to be from organizations which employ larger percentages of 16-21 year olds (r=.10). These employers offer extensive commendations regarding the personalities of younger workers. They use glowing adjectives like "cooperative," "easy going," "adaptive," "sociable," and "responsive to criticism." Furthermore, these employers view younger workers as less prejudiced, less competitive, and therefore more trusting of co-workers and supervisors. They say:

"Youth are more tolerant of individual peculiarities."

"Youth don't have competitive attitudes so there is no dislike for co-workers."

"Older workers experience more jealousy, and fear for their jobs."

"They (older workers) argue more and tend to hold grudges."

"Young workers are friendlier."

Employers frequently define youth as more open, flexible, willing to seek advice, and receptive to different ideas. One interviewee remarks, "Older workers are more set in their ways, less spontaneous." Another feels that "youth are more open and not as judgmental."

Statement #12: "Young workers should receive preferential treatment in hiring and employment policies and practices."

Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the employers disagree with this statement including particularly large numbers of FINS and CONS employers who hire few youth. The majority of respondents are outspoken in their disagreement, questioning the legality of such a policy:

"It's against the law."

"Is against any form of discrimination."

"We're required by law not to provide preferential treatment."

"One would get in trouble with the federal government."

"Equal opportunity is the policy."

Most of those who disagree stress the importance of equal opportunity by asserting that preferential treatment should not be given to any employees. Comments supporting this conviction are:

"Everyone deserves an equal chance."

"You should try to be fair with everyone based on their needs and the company's needs."

"All workers need consideration."

"No one should be given a distinct advantage over another."

The remarks of other employers refer specifically to age discrimination:

> "Age should not count."
>
> "No preferential treatment should be given because of age."
>
> "Age should not be a barrier."
>
> "A person should get what they earn and not get preferential treatment because of age, sex, race."

Some employers comment specifically on the personnel practices of their organization or report that preferential practices do not make good business sense. They say:

> "This is a profit-making venture; qualifications are foremost."
>
> "It's a waste of time, business is business; such treatment adds more time to the personnel process."
>
> "All new employees, young and old, get trained in the same way."
>
> "Age is not a factor. The majority of our jobs are entry-level."
>
> "We hire for jobs by our needs, not age."

Another group stresses the need for every employee to be well qualified, motivated, and competitive in order to be successful regardless of age. Typical comments are:

> "Job should go to the most qualified person."
>
> "Ability and motivation are key elements."
>
> "Everyone should compete against the same standards."
>
> "Every employee should succeed or fail on his own merit."

A few employers who disagree with the statement come to the defense of older workers:

> "Older employees tend to be underutilized and not given enough opportunity. If qualified, you should get the job no matter what your age."
>
> "Older workers are entitled to the same treatment; they have the same abilities."
>
> "Too many older workers are unemployed to prefer youngsters."

Of particular interest are remarks made by employers who are opposed to giving privileges to youth because they consider youth undeserving and unappreciative:

"No! Our biggest turnover is with young people."

"Young workers will leave work for marriage and children."

"Youth will take advantage if any kind of different treatment is given."

"If you give preference to them they will expect it throughout life."

"If you give preference, they tend to not grow and learn."

Only 14% of the employers agree that preferential treatment should be given to younger employees. Many of these employers maintain that society has a particular responsibility to see to it that youth are launched onto a successful career path:

"They need to get started; many of them are good workers."

"They need a chance to be successful."

"Youth need an opportunity to channel their energies into useful work."

"They need an opportunity to gain work experience."

"I do feel they need special consideration in hiring in order to compete with the older workers."

"It might encourage them to pursue a career."

"Preferential treatment would make them more competitive and facilitate the transition into the work-force."

Some of the respondents focus on the importance of offering youth special training:

"They are more receptive to training, would stay longer."

"They need job training and career education to improve their work attitudes and habits."

"Preferential treatment helps develop skills for more effective employees."

"This training could serve as a springboard for future jobs."

A few of the employers comment on their organization's actual policies with respect to young workers:

> "We try to be more understanding."
>
> "Company policy is to seek young workers who want to start a career with us."

A sizeable percentage (28%) of employers think that all employees should be given the same treatment. MANU and TCU employers are most supportive of the idea of equal treatment of older and younger workers. This group does not feel that it is appropriate for management to allow age to affect matters of hiring, training, or promotion. Their comments reflect both actual practices and personal preferences:

> "Qualifications remain the primary criteria for hiring anyone, including youth."
>
> "We don't hire youth for certain jobs just because no one else wants the job. Give kids a job where they can go somewhere with a chance to advance, not a dead-end, non-career job."
>
> "We screen, train, and start all the same."
>
> "They should all be given equal consideration."
>
> "Everyone should work under the same policies and procedures."

Statement #13: "There is less risk in hiring older workers than there is in hiring younger workers."

Employers are fairly evenly divided in their responses to this statement. However, again the largest group of respondents, 38%, report that the risk is the same; that is, age is not a factor in determining risk. There are only small variations in response across industrial categories. Many of those who indicate similarity between age groups feel that risk is determined by the individual.

> "Risk is not a function of age, but individual differences, attitudes, outside factors, etc."
>
> "Any new worker is an unknown factor."
>
> "You can never tell who will work out the best."

Other employers who choose the same option report that risk exists at any age and that neither age group should be considered less risky than the other. Remarks typical of this group are:

> "There's risk in all workers."
>
> "Both older and younger have their own kinds of problems."
>
> "Risks for both young and old--they level out."
>
> "Youth sometimes learn quicker but they also leave sooner."
>
> "There are shortcomings from either side; older workers may have bad habits, but they also have more experience."

Some respondents report that their company's policies and procedures in the areas of screening and training temper the risks inherent in hiring new employees:

> "These (risks) balance out especially with good screening."
>
> "Proper training negates this."
>
> "Employees still must be oriented and performances checked."

Just over one-third (35%) of the employers agree that there is less risk with older workers. MANU and other organizations which tend not to employ many 16-21 year olds show the most support for older workers (r=.10) who are described as more "responsible," "reliable," "dependable," "stable," and "experienced." Statements such as the following also reflect these characteristics:

> "Statistics imply that an older worker will bring more maturity and stability to the position. Older workers have better attendance and less negative incidents."

120

"They've had longer employment and better work history."

"Older workers will work longer and harder because they have the responsibility of fulfilling household needs."

Other employers comment specifically on the lower turnover rate of older workers:

"Older workers are more permanent. Young people will move on."

"Older workers are more likely to have good specific skills and stay on the job."

"Employers are likely to have more turnover with young workers as they experiment with career choices."

"There's more risk in losing young workers to higher paying jobs."

"Because of the turnover factor it's costly to have high turnover."

"They (older workers) don't move as often after training."

Some employers were quite direct in their negative remarks about youth:

"You are taking a chance with young workers who have no work record."

"Young workers have no real job loyalty established."

"Young ones find out how hard the work can be and they think they can find something easier and better paying."

"Young workers are more likely to be fired; its expensive to train them and they walk out."

Twenty-seven percent (27%) of the employers disagree that there is less risk in hiring older workers. CONS employers show the largest percentage (41%) of disagreement. Perhaps this is because of the physical risks inherent in many construction jobs. Remarks noting the limitations of older workers imply that employers are referring to workers who are probably at the higher end of the age continuum:

"Would rather have a young worker because the work is physically hard."

"Prefer young workers because of lifting and loading."

> "The older worker works slower and has limitations."
>
> "Older people get hurt a lot more."
>
> "You must be more careful about union regulations with older workers."

Many employers disagree because they feel that risk is difficult to determine. "Anyone may quit or turn out poorly, not just youth," explains one employer. Other similar remarks are:

> "Both are risks--how long they stay and their type of performance while on the job."
>
> "Risk is very difficult to ascertain."

Others judged from their experience that age does not determine risk:

> "You can have as big a problem with old as well as young."
>
> "There are different problems with each age group."
>
> "There are risks with all new employees."

As with the responses to other statements, there are employers who comment on the individuality of the worker:

> "People are human; there is no perfect person. You have to judge each person individually."
>
> "It's up to the individual to do his best, younger or older, the same risk is involved."

Some respondents take this opportunity to offer positive comments about youth:

> "There's more potential for advancement with a young worker."
>
> "Young people stay longer and work for less."
>
> "Young workers are easier to train."
>
> "Majority of youth are good employees."

Only a few employers make direct negative remarks about older workers:

> "Older workers are more of a risk in that they expect more from a job. If they don't get it, they leave."

> "We tend to have more problems with older workers."
>
> "Young workers don't have ingrained negative attitudes. Older workers carry habits from job to job."

Statement #14: "All things being equal, any employer would prefer to hire older workers."

About four out of ten (42%) of the employers disagree with this statement. There is not much variation in the percent of disagreement across organizational classifications. Many of the employers who disagree with this statement say that they try to hire the best qualified applicants. As one employer says, "You try to get the best you can, regardless of age." Employers try to hire "whoever is capable," "the best suited for the job," or "the most productive workers." Beyond the ability to do the job, attitudes and employment references are also mentioned as criteria which are considered in the hiring process.

Other employers report that they prefer to hire younger workers. Many believe that youth have the potential for long-standing careers and are, therefore, more preferable than older workers:

> "Young workers are willing to start at lower positions."
>
> "Young workers have more potential in terms of future contributions."
>
> "You have a chance to promote young employees and rebuild your institution with young ones."
>
> "Youth have a longer work life ahead, they are sharp and have good potential."
>
> "We hire qualified young workers who are looking for a future. Youth can be sparked."
>
> "We train youth to our specifications."
>
> "They would prefer younger workers. They will stay longer and fit in with clientele better."
>
> "Older workers are not as ambitious and are not looking for promotion. Over the long run older workers may not benefit the organization as a younger person who may move up."

Some employers mention motivation or innovation as the outstanding merits of young workers with comments such as:

> "Younger workers can mean new, innovative ideas."
>
> "Young workers are willing to work harder."
>
> "Young are needed to give fresh blood and new ideas to the company."
>
> "Young workers are more enthusiastic and motivated to prove their ability."
>
> "Youth have more enthusiasm and interest."

Altruistic reasons for hiring younger workers are given by other employers:

> "It's good to give the youth the opportunity to develop their skills."
>
> "Young workers need jobs more than older workers."

Some respondents support their disagreement that employers prefer to hire older workers on the basis that "age makes no difference" in employee performance:

> "There is no age barrier, each group performs well."
>
> "Neither age guarantees quality workers."
>
> "Age is not an absolute factor in defining excellence."
>
> "All ages should be considered. The one who is most qualified should be hired."

A final set of employers who disagree express the importance of hiring both age groups in order to have a heterogeneous pool of workers:

> "You want a balance of the older worker's experience and young worker's energy."
>
> "You need a mixture of both to make the organization viable and outstanding."
>
> "Age mix is healthy--different departments require people of different ages."

Less than one-third (29%) of the respondents agree that employers prefer to hire older workers. These employers praise older workers for their superior on-the-job behavior with comments such as:

> "Older workers are more dependable, more willing to work for paychecks rather than just showing up to collect paychecks."
>
> "Older workers have better attitudes about working."
>
> "They don't create difficulties involving school and socializing."

A great number of employers stress the "reliability" of older workers, with references to their "maturity" and "stability." Some of the respondents attribute these desirable characteristics of older workers to their familial and financial responsibilities. These employers say:

> "Older workers are more stable, have clearer priorities, and are less likely to leave soon after employment."
>
> "They (older workers) tend to be more stable because of families, homes, etc.; they need the job more."
>
> "Maturity, stability, judgement."

Other employers prefer older workers because they are "more seasoned in a general sense; they have more experience." Some of the employers note that because they have more experience, older workers can be trained and supervised at less expense.

In contrast to the employers who were mentioned earlier as investing in youth for the future planning of the organization, this group does not anticipate that younger workers will be worth the investment. The following statements illustrate the fact that some employers do not consider youth to be a valuable resource of personnel because older workers are willing to "stay with a job longer":

> "They're track-proven and willing to stay and improve."
>
> "Older workers do better work and there's less turnover."
>
> "Older workers are a more settled group of people."
>
> "Youth want glory jobs, older people stay because they need jobs."

The remaining 29% of the employers replied same in response to this statement. Their remarks indicate that they do not see age as an index of employee ability or as a factor to be included in hiring decisions:

> "Quality of work doesn't depend on age."
>
> "If performance and qualifications are up to par, there's no difference."
>
> "Hire the best worker possible regardless of age."
>
> "Age is not a qualification except for the minimum--you need both older and younger workers."
>
> "You want both types; one for experience, one for the future."

SUMMARY

For two of the fourteen statements, employers' responses are about evenly divided among the "agree," "disagree," and "same" options. These particular comparisons involve older and younger workers' initiative and the amount of risk which each group represents to their employers. About the same number of employers support older workers, support younger workers, or say that they are the same. A definite preference in response is not evident for these particular comparisons.

In reaction to nine statements, employers either show strong agreement or disagreement. The three statements which elicit the largest percentage of agreement among employers are:

> "Young workers usually arrive at work later."
> (52% Agree, 16% Disagree)
>
> "Older workers are less adaptable to new problems."
> (43% Agree, 29% Disagree)
>
> "Older workers can communicate better."
> (42% Agree, 20% Disagree)

Employers are most likely to disagree and least likely to agree with the following:

"Older workers have worse attendance records than younger ones."

(71% Disagree, 4% Agree)

"Young workers keep their jobs longer than older workers."

(78% Disagree, 4% Agree)

"Young workers generally do better quality work than older ones."

(49% Disagree, 6% Agree)

The following three statements also evoke large percentages of disagreement from employers, although the corresponding percentage of agreement is a bit higher:

"Younger workers should receive preferential treatment in hiring and employment policies and practices."

(58% Disagree, 14% Agree)

"Older workers usually take longer to get their work done."

(45% Disagree, 17% Agree)

"All things being equal, any employer would prefer to hire older workers."

(42% Disagree, 29% Agree)

Employers are most inclined to judge older and younger employees as the same in response to the following comparisons:

"Young workers get along better with their co-workers."

(58% Same)

"Young workers get worse performance evaluations."

(46% Same)

"Older workers have a better chance of being promoted."

(41% Same)

In summary, most of the employers who were interviewed judge younger workers to be tardier, absent more often, and less likely to stay with their jobs than older workers. They also say that younger workers take longer to get their work done, although it should be kept in mind that care is appreciated more than speed by some employers. Employers feel that older workers communicate better and produce better quality work than their younger co-workers. The major fault of older workers is that they are less adaptable to new problems. They judge both age groups as the same with respect to their relations with co-workers, performance evaluations, and chances of being promoted. The majority of employers support egalitarian hiring and employment policies and practices and are not in favor of the preferential treatment of either age group.

Frequently there are only small variations in response choice by industrial category. Those organizations which show strong support for younger employees are not necessarily the ones who employ large numbers of youth. Often organizations such as WRT and SSRT show strong agreement with statements praising the characteristics of older workers, even though a majority of their employees are under 21 years of age. This finding would suggest that because of the nature and benefits of the job, employers are limited in their range of employee choices. They might prefer adults but can only attract youth. On the other hand, sometimes organizations such as those in the CONS and HEWG categories exhibit support for younger workers, although generally they are not major employers of youth.

In several cases the most positive endorsement of young workers does come from respondents whose organizations do employ more youth than older people. Still, it cannot be concluded from these data that age composition of the work force in a specific organization is associated with how respondents judge the generations.

Employers in FINS and those in MANU companies show the largest percentages of "same" rankings. These employers are most inclined to see no difference between younger and older employees. One possible reason might be that conformity to certain rules and standards are fostered in these organizations and variances in performance are not tolerated. Another possible explanation might be that since these industries employ so few youth, age related behaviors are not readily apparent.

Overall, employers stress equal opportunity and they do not believe that age should be a critical criterion in hiring decisions or employment policies and practices. In general, they do not see youth as being very different from older employees. It is true that while youth are appraised negatively for lack of certain work qualities, explanatory caveats are frequently offered. For instance, one of the reasons why youth are said to be tardy and absent from work is that they have domestic, child care, and transportation problems. Besides being absent and late for work, employers judge employee turnover rate to be higher among youth. This turnover, however, can be attributed to the fact that long-term commitments are not expected in the types of jobs for which youth are hired. Many of them are viewed by youth as temporary placements or "fillers" between school semesters or other activities.

CHAPTER VI: ISSUES AND POLICIES OF YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

In this chapter attention is given to a number of policy related issues pertaining to youth employment. The chapter begins with an analysis of data dealing with respondent awareness of youth employment programs and evaluation of the youth who have participated in such programs.

Awareness of Federal Job Training Programs

Each employer respondent was asked whether or not they were aware if their company had employed any youth who had participated in any federal job training program. For the total sample of 1313 respondents the answers to this question were as follows:

Yes -- They are employing such youth: 44%
No -- They are not employing such youth: 29%
Not sure whether they are or not: 27%

When the distribution of responses are examined within the framework of the organizational types, significant differences do occur. HEWG organizations are most likely to respond in the affirmative (61%). The finding would be expected since this category of organizations represents one of the largest employers of program youth and because these are primarily non-profit, governmentally funded agencies. For the remaining seven industrial organizations the positive response rate varies from 21% for CONS to 58% for FINS. With the exception of HEWG, the number of respondents in an organizational category does not appear to be correlated in any positive manner with awareness. The finding is somewhat peculiar since the number of employer respondents selected in each organizational category was determined by the number of program youth employed by that organization. Possible explanations might be that the individual interviewed for this study was not involved in the hiring of a particular program or control group applicant. It is also likely that in some cases youth do not choose to declare past participation in a federally funded program. Finally, there may be organizations which do not seek to highlight the fact that they do employ program youth.

Uncertainty as to whether or not such youth have been employed is highest for CONS (35%) and FINS (30%). Not surprising, it is among the HEWG respondents where uncertainty is least prevalent (21%).

Interestingly enough the awareness picture presented above does not change in any dramatic manner when there is control for participants and non-participants. That is, only a slightly greater number of employers of program youth state they have employed such youth than is the case for employers of non-program (control) youth.

Although the differences are in the expected direction, greater variation would have been a reasonable expectation. A variety of possible explanations might be offered, some noted earlier. Yet another alternative interpretation might be that in some instances there was not a proper matching of youth with employers; cases where interviewers failed to follow respondent selection groundrules.

Those respondents who answered in the affirmative were then asked to indicate approximately how many youth who had participated in any federal job training program had been hired by the respondent's organization. The average for all eight industrial organizations was nineteen (19). The largest single employer is, according to this survey, HEWG with thirty-three (33). There was no attempt made to determine whether these were full or part-time jobs, subsidized, temporary, or within what period of time such employment occurred. Manufacturing is the second largest employer of federal job training program participants (24);

followed by FINS and CONS (12 each). Once again, with the exception of HEWG organizations, there is little in the way of an expected fit between organizational sample size (based upon reported employment of participants and controls*) and number of program youth estimated to have been employed.

Nor is there a direct relationship between reported employment of program participants and control group members and employer's knowledge about federal job training programs in which youth employees might have participated. We do, however, find that those most knowledgeable about such programs are HEWG employers (34% "very knowledgeable" and 55% "somewhat knowledgeable").

All together, about a fifth of the employers say they know nothing about such programs; a little more than half say they are somewhat knowledgeable about such programs, and the remaining twenty-five percent (25%) say they are very knowledgeable.

Program participant employers are a little more likely to report that they are very knowledgeable about these programs than control group employers (20% and 13% respectively).

In Table VI-1 are found the distribution of responses to a question asking employers:

> "Overall, how well prepared was/were the youth from the federal training programs?"

The sample size in Table VI-1 is restricted to those employers who stated that their organizations employed youth who had participated in some federal job-training program.

---

*See Table II-1

Table VI-1*

Employers and Assessment of Program Participant's Preparation

Level of Preparation	Employers (%)
Exceptional	20
Sufficient	54
Poorly	13
Don't Know	13
	N = 617

Table VI-1 indicates that the great majority of employers are fairly generous in their assessments of the level of preparation of federal job-training program participants.

An analysis of employer evaluations within the framework of the eight industrial organizational types does show significant variations. Of the 617 respondents who indicate that they have employed employment program participants, the most enthusiastic assessment comes from the CONS (31%) and FINS (27%) group who state that these new employees were "exceptionally well prepared." WRT employers, while less glowing in their evaluations, are relatively positive with about a quarter (24%) reporting that the youth they hired from these programs were "exceptionally well prepared." The strongest praise, then, comes from the two industrial organizations quite far apart on the employment selectivity scale: FINS which is most selective in age, educational and behavioral qualifications, and CONS which tends to be among the least selective. Those less likely to make the "exceptional" assessment are SSRT and TCU (both 15%) and MANU (13%) employers. It is likely that only the very best of program participants are directed toward the FINS employment pool, while those entering SSRT organizations are younger with greater educational deficiencies.

---

*Full Response Statements

I. "Exceptionally well prepared: education closely matched entry job requirements."

II. "Sufficiently prepared: education covered most entry-job requirements, but missed some."

III. "Poorly prepared: education did not cover most entry job requirements."

Excluding FFF where the sample size is two (2), the most severe evaluations of entry-level preparation come from TCU and MANU respondents with about a fifth of each group viewing youth as "poorly prepared." It should be noted that these percentages are subject to both inflation and deflation since there are also significant differences in the proportion of employers in each industrial category selecting the "Don't Know" response.

The larger the organization, no doubt, the more likely it is that the employer respondent would not have had direct contact with the youth employee. Regardless of the variation among organizational types, the overall evaluations are fairly positive:

20% - saying that program youth are exceptionally well prepared
54% - saying they are sufficiently prepared
13% - saying they are poorly prepared
13% - saying they cannot make any judgements on level of preparation

A final awareness question asked of each employer respondent sought to determine their familiarity with the local youth employment project. Each respondent was provided the name of the local project by the interviewer. For example: "Have you ever heard of the RTP-- School to Work Program (or YCD Program) in Nashville?".

For the overall sample (1276 respondents) a majority (64%) say they have not heard of the locally designated program. Four out of ten do respond in the affirmative. An affirmative answer is more likely to come from those identified as employers of participants than from those identified as employers of control group youth. Differences between the eight industrial organizations are not significant (excluding FFF, the range of local program awareness is 30% for TCU and 44% for HEWG). All in all, it would seem safe to say that most employer respondents, be they employers of program participants or not, were not familiar with the names of local youth employment programs.

Differential Minimum Wage

Having devoted some time to employer familiarity with and assessment of federally sponsored youth employment programs, our attention now turns to more general policy related matters. The issue of a minimum wage differential for young workers has long been a subject of some debate among policy makers as well as employers and union officials. The basic assumptions made by advocates favoring a lowering of the minimum wage are that such a move would motivate employers to hire more youth. It is also commonly believed that the majority of employers would endorse a minimum wage differential and would respond to such a change by increasing their pools of entry level youth employees.

Counter arguments have also been presented by a wide range of union officials, employment policy authorities, and national organizations.[1] Although there are a variety of studies which attempt to project the potential impact on employment of a differential minimum wage policy, there appears to be little in the way of empirical data dealing with employer attitudes toward such a policy change.

---

[1] See, for example, Sar A. Levitan, "Coping with Teenage Unemployment," National Commission for Manpower Policy, The Teenage Unemployment Problem: What are the Options? Washington, D.C. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Jobs for the Hard to Employ: New Directions for a Public/Private Partnership Committee for Economic Development, New York, N.Y. 1979.

The employer respondents in this survey express, for the most part, opposition to a lowering of the minimum wage for young employees (ages 16-21). More than three-fourths (78%) are opposed to such an across the board reduction while a fifth (20%) are in favor.

Although differences between industrial organizations are not significant, there are a number of interesting variations. The stongest advocates for the lowering of the minimum wage for youth are those organizations which do tend to employ the greatest proportion of entry level youth (SSRT-27% and WRT-22% in favor).

The stongest opposition comes from those organizations which tend to have high union membership enrollments (TCU, MANU, CONS), and HEWG which is made up largely of governmental agencies and national organizations.

Four factors appear to be related to the differences and attitudes toward the minimum wage. They are:

1. Lowering the minimum wage will make more jobs available to youth.
2. The current minimum wage is too high a price to pay for inexperienced, entry level youth.
3. The higher the average wages paid by the organization, the less inclined they are to hire more youth as a result of a lowered minimum wage (r=.11).
4. If employers favor lowering the minimum wage, they say that they would be more likely to hire youth if their wages were lowered (r=.42).

Comments employers offered to support the advantage of a minimum wage reduction include:

> "It is important to give teens a chance to earn money and thus keep them out of trouble."
>
> "It would encourage employers to hire younger workers and provide them with experience."
>
> "It would help all kids, not just some, find a job."
>
> "It would stimulate employment of young workers."

Those who endorse the lowering of the minimum wage are quick to point out that the current wage is already too high, and that this condition does contribute to inflation. These employers hold that young workers are overpaid even at minimum wage by virtue of their inexperience and need to work part-time. Further, there are some who believe that young people already have too much money and they are taking wages away from older, more needy and more deserving employees.

> "Their lack of experience should not require them to be paid as much as older workers."
>
> "It really raises the prices to have to pay for it."
>
> "A part-time worker shouldn't get that high of wage--it runs up the cost."
>
> "Training is so expensive."
>
> "I cannot afford to pay wages to young workers who have no skill."
>
> "I don't think they need as much to live on."
>
> "They don't have expenses. Older workers do."
>
> "For those in school, that's a lot of money for them to make in school."

A few respondents favored lowering the wage, but with qualifications that it should be done during training, for students, and part-time employees:

> "Minimum wage should be lowered for training a person for a job."
>
> "It should be only for part-time."
>
> "Especially for students. They are not on the job that many hours or working to full potential."
>
> "Only if it would make them more marketable."
>
> "Only for students and those under 18."

As noted above, the majority of respondents are in favor of maintaining current minimum wage laws and offer diverse arguments to support their views on this issue. The two most frequent objections were that employees should be paid equal pay for equal work, and that age alone should not determine one's wages.

> "We would not want to see two people performing the same task at different wages."
>
> "Everyone is entitled to work and should be paid the same."
>
> "If they are able to do the same job as older workers, they are entitled to the same pay."
>
> "People should not be asked to work for less than their fellow workers."
>
> "Young workers should be paid the going rate of each particular job."

A significant number of respondents protest that the minimum wage is low enough, and must not be made lower in the light of current economic conditions.

> "The cost of living is going up--wages should go up too."
>
> "The way taxes are, everyone needs as much money as anyone."
>
> "Because of inflation; cost of living."
>
> "If they [workers] are worth minimum wage, they're worth more."
>
> "Wage is low enough, any lower the employees would steal."

Another group of respondents argue that young workers need their wages as much as do older workers.

> "They need to make a living like everyone else."
>
> "They depend on it as much as anyone--high cost of living is just as bad for them."
>
> "They have a hard time making it on current minimum."
>
> "Many young workers are supporting themselves or providing financial aid to their families."
>
> "If they have to work, they should be paid the same money."
>
> "They should be able to at least make a decent salary."

Yet another perceived consequence of lowering the minimum wage is that it could lead to the exploitation of younger workers. Such a policy would have negative results for both the employer in terms of decreased quality and production, and the employees who not only earn substandard wages, but become increasingly disillusioned.

"It would be demoralizing to younger workers."

"That will discourage kids to work for almost nothing per hour."

"Employers would then take advantage of younger workers."

"Slave labor."

"Penalized for youth."

"Company gets richer, workers lose."

Directly relative to this issue is the belief that poorer performance would follow, no matter the age group effected, should the wages not be in keeping with either a federal standard or the job market. Minimum wage is viewed as having the further advantage of attracting and possibly keeping workers on the job.

"Would add to the problem of quality of work by youth."

"They wouldn't work for less."

"Money keeps people on the job."

"Good performance is required and pay is necessary."

"The quality and performance would be very poor."

"People will not work if wages are too small."

Other respondents think that lowering the minimum wage would be less fair to older workers by displacing them from the job market. These respondents considered it a form of reverse discrimination since older workers would no longer be competitive.

> "It would harm the employability of older workers."
>
> "It would force the employer to fire his long term workers to improve profits."
>
> "It would create more of an employment problem for older workers."
>
> "Too many adult breadwinners are displaced."

A handful of respondents admitted that any change in the level of minimum wage would not affect them directly, either because of personal reasons or because their businesses are unionized or similarly regulated.

> "We don't really have any flexibility. Our schedules are set by the government."
>
> "We would maintain our current staff regardless of reduction in minimum wage."
>
> "No effect on our operations. No bearing on our industry."

Minimum Wage Reduction and Youth Hiring

The response percentages remain the same when the question asked is, "Would you hire more youth if the minimum wage was lowered?" Seventy-seven percent (77%) responded no and twenty-three percent (23%) answer yes. As might be expected, those most likely to endorse lowering the minimum wage are most likely to say they would hire additional youth if that wage action was implemented. SSRT organizations, the largest employer of youth, were most in support of lowering the minimum wage (27%) and are most inclined (30%) to state that such an action would lead them to employ more youth.

Those respondents who state they would hire additional youth felt that such a change could open more positions for youth and be economically advantageous to employers and industry. Assuming no other constraints (such as union regulations), they tend to agree that such a wage policy would encourage employers to hire more youth. They point to the full range of economic implications of such a practice; (a) more people would be employed, (b) their (the employers') labor expenses would be reduced, (c) they could offer increased or better products and services to customers, and (d) profits would rise. Their comments reflect these attitudes:

a---
"It would open more positions."
"It would help to get youth a job that would provide work experience."
"More could get jobs."
"I could afford to try out more youth for these jobs."

b---
"Labor expenses would be lower."
"It would stretch budgeted funds further."
"We could do more within our labor-wage guidelines."
"We could be more flexible in our hiring practices."

c---
"More kids working, more gets done, and much faster."
"I'd be able to give better service with more employees."

d---
"We'd save money."
"It would be good for profits."
"Economics."

Many respondents disagree simply because they do not have the flexibility to hire extra workers, regardless of wage level, because of legal contracts or fixed workloads. These respondents usually state that lowering the wage would not develop more jobs, or affect their individual hiring practices.

For example:

"Must have only a certain percent (youth)."
"We hire only what we need."

"We'd still hire the same number."

"The wage itself has no bearing on our needs."

"Minimum wage is not what prevents me from hiring--other considerations determine hiring needs."

"Our office labor force is set by law."

"We already have many (youth)--work available is the key factor rather than wage."

"We wouldn't be effected because we don't employ young workers because our clients prefer mature workers."

"More workers than needed may cause problems."

"Wage is not a factor."

A second group of respondents argue that lowering the wage would be likely to create more problems by causing dissention among workers. Furthermore, most businesses are controlled by pre-determined wage schedules.

"It'd be impossible to have people doing the same job at different wages."

"Other workers would complain."

"Salary grades are established regardless of age."

"We maintain a job schedule based on job responsibilities."

"Union contracts restrict this."

"Equal pay for the same job."

Some respondents feel that lowering the wages would actually make it more difficult to recruit qualified workers and keep them on the job. Lower wages would also affect the level of production and quality of work by any group of workers.

"The best workers want enough pay."

"It would be harder to hire."

"I don't think they would work for less."

> "I can't pay less and expect the same work."
>
> "You'd be hiring kids who couldn't get any other job, not desirable employees."
>
> "Definitely not, a lower wage would not provide incentive to do a good job."
>
> "We have difficulty attracting the people we desire at the wage we do offer."
>
> "You get what you pay for."

Another group favors maintaining the minimum wage because of inflation and/or their desire not to exploit workers. The following comments best typify these sentiments:

> "Young workers would not be exploited by my agency."
>
> "Inflation permits youth to barely make it on $3.35."
>
> "Sub-minimum wages perpetuate poverty."
>
> "If lowered it would not meet the youth's economic needs in terms of supporting themselves."
>
> "Conviction to paying fair wages."

Many respondents repeat a popular opinion expressed throughout the interview: that hiring has nothing to do with a person's age. For example:

> "We are looking for experience and attitudes, not age."
>
> "People should be paid on knowledge, experience and ability to get the job done."
>
> "We don't have just 'youth jobs.'"
>
> "If they do a good job, we'll pay them for it."

A few remarked without elaboration, that they do not pay the minimum wage. One respondent, however, did say: "We employ four youth at sub-minimum wage because of their age--we've applied for the waiver and received permission."

A final group of respondents add that they now pay younger workers more than minimum wage:

> "We pay more than minimum wage to all employees."
>
> "Most (of our) positions pay more than minimum wage."
>
> "This organization has no problems paying the youth what it does and can."
>
> "We would never start a youth at minimum wage."

Preferential Treatment of Minority Youth

There is also very strong consensus among employer respondents opposing the preferential treatment of minorities in the hiring of youth.

Seventy-eight percent (78%) disagree that such a policy should be implemented, while the remainder (22%) would endorse a preferential selection process. The strongest support (33%) for preferential treatment comes from HEWG organizations which are the largest single employer of both program and control group minority youth. With the exception of HEWG, nearly eight out of ten of all other employers express opposition to a policy of preferential treatment for minority youth.

Comments made most frequently by those who choose "yes" in response to this question are general in nature, providing no specific reason for the need for preferential treatment of minority youth. The comments indicate a desire on the part of these employers to provide minority youth with a chance in the work place. Examples of comments are:

> "Try to help minorities."
>
> "Need some help to get on their feet."
>
> "Not getting the chance they should be getting. They should get a break."
>
> "Might help them rise above poverty status."
>
> "To encourage minority youth."

"They need an opportunity to have a job."

"Might help them later in life."

"To give them an opportunity to get experience."

"There is a need to push employment of young."

"Most times they haven't had the breaks that other youth have gotten."

The idea that minorities have been discriminated against in the past, and that preferential treatment in the work place is a reasonable approach to overcome past inequities, is voiced less frequently than the more general comments noted above. Examples of these comments are:

"Because minority youth have been and still are discriminated against."

"Because minorities have constantly been segregated against in employment hiring."

"Some commitment should be made because of past inequities."

"To remedy past ills."

"To compensate for the discriminatory practices which have led to the high rate of unemployment among minorities."

"Because of unfair labor practices in the past and for future improvement."

"They have been discriminated against and need a chance to catch up."

"So often color and ethnic background is used as a yardstick for performance and productivity."

"To make up for all the past inequities."

Some respondents note that preferential treatment is necessary or appropriate due to deficits in the educational system or American society. These comments suggest that minority youth, through no fault of their own, are at a disadvantage and should therefore be provided with added opportunities.

"Lack of available training."

"Educational system and society at large have not met the needs of minorities."

"Society has not provided equal levels of development for some minorities."

Others believe that the practice of preferential treatment for minority youth is the only way these youth can gain entrance into the work force. Preferential treatment is seen by these respondents as the means by which minority youth get an equal chance in the job market. Without preferential treatment, non-minorities are seen to have an advantage.

> "This is the only way many minorities will ever get a chance to prove what they are capable of doing."
>
> "Everyone should have an equal chance. Inequities still exist."
>
> "In ordinary circumstances non-minorities have an advantage."
>
> "Hoping to arrive at some other means of getting them job opportunities hasn't worked out."

Affirmative action regulations are occasionally mentioned by respondents. A few comment that by treating minorities preferentially, government may be relieved of some of its burden and that such treatment is beneficial to the economy. Examples of these comments are:

> "I support affirmative actions."
>
> "We have an active EEO Program."
>
> "We're morally in favor of equal opportunity employment."
>
> "Would encourage and in some cases would help the economy by taking some of the weight off government agencies."

The majority of comments made by those who answered "no" to this question reflect a very strong view that preferential treatment is an unacceptable form of discrimination and contrary to American politics and social values.

> "No one race of people should be favored. We'll be going backward. All equal--no prefernece."
>
> "No I don't think preferential treatment should be given to anyone because of race, etc."
>
> "Everyone should be hired on an equal basis."
>
> "All should be treated equally."

> "There should be equal opportunity for young of all races."
>
> "It is un-American to hire or fire because of race."
>
> "There should not be preferential treatment based on race."
>
> "Why differentiate? Everybody should have the same chance."
>
> "No, but rather an equal fair chance."
>
> "It should be equal. I don't believe in preferential treatment of young people."

Some see preferential employment policies as a stimulus for conflict among employees.

> "Equal training and balanced treatment is essential for all personnel."
>
> "Believe all should be treated the same and then there is fewer problems with all employees."
>
> "[Preferential treatment] causes problems with other youth not given preferential treatment."
>
> "You do that and you have no morale left in the place."

Qualifications for the job were mentioned frequently by respondents who do not agree with preferential treatment. Along with qualifications these employees note appropriate training, skills, ability, and past experience as appropriate considerations for employment decisions. These respondents place the individual's appropriateness for the job above preferential treatment. Some comments note screening procedures. For example:

> "Need emphasis on being best candidate for job and not filling a quota."
>
> "Minority [status] can be a factor, but more important to look at education and skill."
>
> "Depends on their qualifications and capabilities to carry out the job."
>
> "Performance is the criteria--not race."
>
> "It should be based on desire, aptitude, and ability to work."
>
> "Regardless of who--qualified and enthusiastic is what matters."

"No reason to. Race or color has nothing to do with performance."

"All applicants are screened thoroughly and [are] hired depending upon qualifications."

"We hire young people on the basis of their potential."

"Qualified should get jobs."

Finally, respondents refer to EEO and Affirmative Action Policies in their comments. For example, one said that "EEO laws state that race or sex should not be a factor" and another simply remarked that he is an "Equal Opportunity Employer." One comment noted that preferential treatment is reverse discrimination--"I do not believe in reverse discrimination."

"Racism."

"Discrimination is repugnant."

Work Behavior of Minority and Non-Minority Youth

Better than eight out of ten employers (88%) feel that minority youth are no more or no less a risk or problem in the work place than are white youth of similar socio-economic background. Differences between industrial organizations are minimal and of no significance.

Prior to the presentation of comments it is worth noting that many respondents did not take the factor of socio-economic status into consideration. Expressed comments suggest rather, that employers were limiting their assessments only to differences between minority and non-minority youth.

Those who did agree that minority youth were a greater risk frequently commented that minority youth are more of a problem because of past deficits in education, training, and work experience. Other comments are not as specific but reflect a belief that minority youth, more so than white youth, have experienced familial and personal trauma. Comments follow:

> "Less experienced, training, exposure."
>
> "Lack of job related skills and experience."
>
> "Haven't had the opportunity to create good work habits."
>
> "Backgrounds are limited."
>
> "Because they come with more problems--at home, economics, etc."
>
> "Need to be trained in work habits and proper attitude on job."
>
> "Because of background, social up-bringing, attitudes of the minority individual."

Poor work attitudes are noted:

> "Attitude is rock bottom."
>
> "Has appeared to be job attitude."

Others, however, point to the lack of self confidence or self esteem.

> "Poor self esteem and lack of education."
>
> "The youth feel insecure in the job place, therefore they perform poorly."
>
> "It's harder for minorities to adjust."
>
> "Basically, difficulty is adjusting to a different atmosphere."

Others noted, without elaboration, that minority youth are less eager to commit themselves to a job.

> "Generally, they do not want to dedicate themselves to the job."
>
> "They usually don't stick around long enough to be worth it."

Though infrequent, there are some severe and sweeping generalizations:

> "They create problems."
>
> "Because they are generally dishonest."
>
> "Have had lots of black youth talk back and disobey rules."

The majority of respondents, as noted earlier, do not see race as being highly associated with the work performance or attitude of youthful employees. At the same time, and as will be noted in the discussion which follows, there is some sentiment that socio-economic background may make a difference in how youth perform on the job.

> "On the job they are no different than any other youth."
>
> "I've observed no difference" and "All youth are the same."
>
> "Minorities are as intelligent and responsible as other youth."
>
> "A person's race has nothing to do with the job."
>
> "From my personal experience, they follow the same rules and adapt like anyone else."
>
> "I have not noticed a greater risk."
>
> "We've had no problems or risks with minority youth hired here."
>
> "Our experience has shown that all of our youth tend to be well motivated for this type of work."

A smaller group of respondents believe that youth are similar, but also include in their comments the notion that youth are more of a risk than older, more mature employees.

> "All youth have the same difficulties in employment."
>
> "Have had equal success and failure with hiring minority disadvantaged and other disadvantaged."
>
> "We have had kids from all roots--and problems have arisen in every status."
>
> "There is always risk regardless of status."
>
> "All youth are risky in the workplace."

The comments of employers more than suggest that they try not to generalize, but rather consider the individual. Many simply say that performance "depends on the individual." Some note that an individual's attitude or values are relevant.

> "I view everyone equally allowing for individual shortfalls."

> "If someone truly wants to work he isn't going to cause any problems such as being late or absent."
>
> "Any incompetence on job or absenteeism stems from individual's attitude, not his race."
>
> "All individuals should be judged as such and the risks or problems are the same with minority and non-minority groups."
>
> "Individual characteristics govern hiring here, race is not a factor."
>
> "Doesn't make any difference. Look for good work attitudes."

Socio-economic status is mentioned by some as being associated with variations in youth performance and attitude. Most of these comments emphasize the relationship between the SES of youth and the potential high risk to the employer as well as the lack of relationship between minority status and risk.

> "Encounter the same problems with employees of the same SES; race does not make the difference."
>
> "Poor is poor in any race, and poverty creates other problems."
>
> "They seem to have some 'class' problems that transcend race."
>
> "Youth of the same socio-economic status have basically the same problems."
>
> "Problems, social and economic, know no color."
>
> "More a question of socio-economic [status] than a race factor."
>
> "Not so much race as social class."
>
> "Race has nothing to do with it. It is a matter of poor and not poor."

The question: "Do you consider low income youth an even greater risk or problem in the workplace than other youth?"

also generates limited endorsement from respondents. Employers who view minority youth as a greater risk in the workplace are also more inclined to view low income youth as a greater risk (r=.40). Still, about twice as many (22%) agree with this statement than was the case in minority/non-minority youth comparisons. There also appears to be some differences in how employers from various industrial organizations respond to this question. Discounting

FFF where three of thirteen (23%) respondents agree, the following distribution is obtained:

Percent Agreeing	
SSRT	24%
HEWG	21%
MANU	20%
FINS	20%
WRT	18%
CONS	11%
TCU	10%

Once again those who disagree stress the points of individual differences and the dangers of generalization.

> "We have no experience to indicate low income youth present greater problems of risks."
>
> "I cannot tie any discipline problems to income background."
>
> "We have a mixture of low income and high income, and I've noticed no risk."
>
> "Economics is no barrier."
>
> "Low income doesn't mean they're going to create a problem."
>
> "Just because a person's poor, doesn't mean they're a risk."

Many respondents feel strongly that low income youth in particular were less of a risk than other employees. They credited such youth with above-average motivation, persistance, and ability, often out-performing other workers.

> "A great deal of low income youth really want to prove themselves on the job and do well."
>
> "In some cases its a better risk, they're most interested in hanging onto a job."
>
> "Not necessarily--many of them are motivated to get ahead."

"Based on my experience they are motivated even more."

"Disadvantaged youth want to work, whereas privileged youth feel no challenge."

"They are appreciative of a chance to work."

"If they are given a chance, they will hang with it."

"Low income youth try much harder to abide by rules and regulations."

"Many are trying to get ahead and are willing to work."

Additionally, several respondents comment on the high personal standards and ethical values of these young workers:

"I have experienced that low-income youth are brought up with great values."

"Some have strong, ethical family values."

"We have more theft from people from upperclass families."

Relative to this latter remark are criticisms of more affluent employees.

"To us upper-median income causes more problems--poor attitude, not really being a hard worker."

"Upper income youth are more inclined to drugs and often take advantage of a job to support a drug habit."

"Advantaged youth may have poor attitudes--do not have as much at stake as poorer youth."

The remaining comments, though noteworthy, are less frequent. A few respondents feel that risk is not characterized by income or background, but rather characteristics of youth.

"Problems are general problems of youth."

"Age is the problem, not race."

"All youth have the same basic problems."

"Most youth are low-income."

A handful of responses indicate that some employers seek to avoid knowing anything about the employees' social or economic status.

153

> "A lot of times we don't know their income level--we just want good workers."
>
> "We are not interested in where they came from."
>
> "I never inquire about income."

A final group feel that while no serious risk is involved, younger workers and low income youth do benefit from supervision and specialized training.

> "They can perform if taught properly."
>
> "They need more training and supervision."
>
> "All they need is special training."
>
> "They require closer supervision and more intense training."
>
> "Not if they want to work and you work with them. They can be taught and trained."

Respondents who agree that disadvantaged youth are more of a work related problem, are without exception, quite willing to share their views. For this group of employers, low-income youth are broadly characterized as: lacking education or skills training; holding negative work attitudes and habits; having family or personal problems, as well as suffering from economic deprivation. Many of the remarks, however, appear to be qualified with the caveat that these youth are victims more to be pitied than scorned.

> "Their upbringing carries with it domestic and other types of problems."
>
> "[Their] environmental background is so different from the norm."
>
> "[Their] social background might be different and present some barriers."
>
> "Generally associated with low income workers is a lesser integration into society, more to overcome."
>
> "Low income youth have had less supervision in the home [growing up]; develop poor attitude."
>
> "90% of the time they are, because they come from a deprived environment."
>
> "The 'system' has made them a higher risk."
>
> "More problems brought to the job due to the life style."

"Low income youth don't look to future--just live day-to-day because they were brought up that way."

"They haven't learned to work--they haven't had the home example to follow."

Other problems mentioned are more specific to the workplace. Two often related complaints are that many low income youth are unskilled, uneducated, or inexperienced, and that they have not as yet internalized the "work ethic."

"All young workers need more skills and experience."

"They lack exposure to the office environment; perspective may be different related to personal property and attendance."

"Their attitude reflects that they want and need money, but do not know how to work, feel a job is owed to them--seem to have personal problems."

"They just don't have a hard work attitude in which the middle class has."

"They generally lack employability skills."

"I try to give them the biggest break--they have a worse attitude and next-to-nothing in home training."

"Low income workers need job orientation."

"Usually, educational level is not as great."

"In my experience they have the attitude of 'I don't care' and 'I'm here only for my paycheck and nothing else."

Trustworthiness is of concern to some respondents, although some of their particular concern may be related to the nature of their business or industry:

"[They] are more difficult to trust."

"I am more likely to keep an 'eye' on them unconsciously because of their upbringing. We have had alot of theft problems in the past."

"They are more apt to be an internal theft problem."

"In this business, there's a strong temptation to steal."

"If risk is defined according to economic need, lower income youth are more likely to take leftovers home for themselves or family or are more likely to take company's money--I understand this."

> "Possibility of theft."
>
> "I think they might steal money."

Another problem area mentioned includes work attitudes, motivation, and discipline.

> "Their attitude and value systems are different than non-low-income youth. Low income youth are less motivated, less self-sufficient and need more supervision."
>
> "Low income youth lack self-motivation due to handouts from social services/government."
>
> "Often quit."
>
> "Usually they lack dependability."
>
> "Low income youth are less stable, more likely to quit, or not show up to work."
>
> "Low income youth are less reliable."
>
> "Tend to be job hoppers."
>
> "Tend to leave sooner."

A final group of remarks includes behavior and appearance, and were much less frequently mentioned:

> "They generally lack manners, speech, social graces."
>
> "Personal hygiene and appearance tend to be a problem."

Job Training Assistance for Low Income Youth

Yet another question which provokes a high degree of consensus is one that asked respondents the following:

> "Do you feel that some job training/job assistance should be provided for low income youth to enhance their opportunities for employment?"

Better than eight out of ten (82%) respondents agree that some job assistance should in fact be offered to low income youth. Omitting FFF, where the sample is limited, significant differences are again apparent among the other seven industrial organizations.

Support for training is highest among HEWG and FINS employers, (both 90%). Disagreement, on the other hand, is most prevalent among CONS employers (26%), SSRT (23%), and WRT (22%). Speculation as to the reasons for these significant variations would be along the following lines:

> HEWG employers, in this study at least, were the major employer of program and control group youth as well as the largest employer of minority group youth. Further, the HEWG organizations in this sample are heavily dominated by public sector agencies.
>
> FINS employers, while not major hirers of youth, do require and are dependent upon entry level workers with specific skills and proficiencies.
>
> SSRT, WRT, and CONS employers account for most of the nation's entry level youth employment and place youth in jobs which require minimal job skills or cognitive accomplishments.

The majority of employers who do agree that some job training or assistance should be provided to low income youth did attempt to specify the type of training they felt would be appropriate. As might be anticipated, individual respondents frequently cited more than one type of training. Each of the following were mentioned: a) basic educational training; b) training in job seeking skills and job holding skills; c) preparatory training about working and work environment; and d) training about appropriate work attitudes and behaviors. Hands on training, actual work experience, or on-the-job training were favored (e). Comments about training in specific job knowledges or skills were also expressed (f). Mentioned less frequently are: g) training should be available to everyone; h) program sponsorship; and i) incentives to employees.

A. Comments about training in basic educational skills and statements that indicate training should be done by the schools are most prevalent.

Educational training (basic education and career education):

"More basic education, training in working with other people, available for youth of all income backgrounds."

"Training in basic skills such as reading, writing, office skills, job placement, special programs to provide work experience."

"Better basic education."

"Remedial reading/writing (communications).

"Basic reading and writing to fill out job applications, etc."

"Basic education is necessary; good math and English, writing, speaking. Understanding business environment."

"Greater educational opportunities to help them realize their career potential."

"Basic educational opportunities should be given to low income youth."

"Career education, job development, and placement."

"Career education and preferential treatment in hiring."

"Basically career counseling; labor market orientation; exposure to various industries and agencies."

Training by schools:

"Some job training here. The high schools should do more training on basic skills (filling out forms, being on time) to hold a job. Also language."

"High school level skills training; work-study programs."

"Schools should place more emphasis on the importance of having the skills for doing various types of jobs, e.g. typing."

"In high school where they need job training to be sent out to the work force, perhaps half days the last year on a work experience program."

"Facts of what they have been trained for. This should be done twice;

once entering high school and once at the start of the 4th year."

"Integrated program with school (7-12) focusing on employment development; career development."

"Should be something through the schools in the development of pre-employability skills: filling out applications, interviewing, basic skills, dress, etc."

"Schools should stress what business is all about. The concept of profit."

"Better school training and greater job preparation is needed. They should be given basics (reading, writing, spelling). Next they should be given on-the-job training."

"Training in school seminars by private sector on their job skills."

"Career orientation at school at an early age."

B. Comments about job seeking and/or job holding skills are also frequently cited.

Training in job seeking skills and job holding skills:

"Courses in attitude, financial planning, job expectation, basic job interview, filling out application, skills related to getting a job."

"Finding jobs, keeping jobs, counseling."

"Job seeking skills (filling out applications, handling an interview and proper appearance)."

"Should receive educational counseling expressing the importance of basics (reading, writing, communicating). Should have interviewing training; need career goals and work behavior."

"Job seeking and job keeping skills--attitude toward workers and supervisors."

"Training in basic job skills--how to apply, where and how."

"Services which enhance interviewing skills, job holding and job seeking skills."

"Career education should be taught to include job search skills, interviewing techniques, career awareness and survival skills."

"The types of services would be basic job skills, such as filling out resumes and communicating with supervisors."

"Employment skills, interviewing, applications, job retention skills."

C. Closely related to job seeking and holding skills are comments about pre-employment preparation, including preparation for the work environment.

Job preparation/pre-employment training/preparation for the realities of the working environment:

"Pre-employment preparation."

"I would like to see more job training programs for youth that would help a great deal in getting them better prepared."

"Pre-employment and training; job sampling; economic assistance prior to earning a salary."

"Programs to teach them how to adapt to work."

"Job orientation about the work world and job placement assistance."

"Exposure to work environment."

D. Statements about employee attitudes and behaviors are made almost as often as comments concerning job seeking and holding skills.

Training in appropriate attitudes and work behavior:

"Job training to provide a sense of responsibility, proper attitude."

"As far as our company is concerned, clerical training would be important. Generally, training in attitudes and responsibility would enhance opportunities for employment."

"...orientation to work place (attitudes) are more of a problem than skills."

"Work habits."

"Educational, vocational, and programs directed towards a responsible attitude."

"Training in work behavior. Access to job opportunity."

"Activities centered around acknowledging rules, punctuality, respect, attitudes, effort, attendance, etc."

"Career counseling, work habits and work behavior type-training sessions should be offered."

E. Hands-on training activities are considered most beneficial.

On-the-job training and other forms of hands-on experience:

"A program in which youth could become involved in the work they want to do--the actual experience."

"Help them gain some experience, help to improve the level of one's ability."

"OJT."

"Work experience, job preparation and skill training, employment counseling. Job search skills."

"More programs like this which expose them to work."

"Our employees are trained on a continuous basis."

"Program between the company and the school to give the kids some type of hands-on experience."

"Each company should have their own training program for the job they have and set placement goals for those jobs."

"Actual job/career related training so as to put them into the job market to compete on an equal basis."

"Cross training into other departments."

"Training under person(s) skilled in area--on-the-job training."

F. Other respondents specify training in specific skills or areas of knowledge.

Vocational training:

"Should have training in vocations."

"More vocational schools so they are able to immediately go to work."

"General job skills by basic vocational training."

Clerical/office training:

"Office skills."

"Helping them in the basic skill areas, office (typing) related skills. Knowledge about computers, employability--youth don't feel they are being prepared properly in schools. If not in school, why at job site?"

Technical training:

"Counseling (school & job) entry level technical training."

"Technical skills in an area overlooked or given little attention in the schools is on general small business practices (i.e. applying what you learn to a real position). Everyone is not going to be an executive. How to apply for a job."

"Technical skills and on-the-job training."

Management training:

"Managment training programs."

"Low income training institutes in the field of technology and management."

G. A smaller proportion of employers expressed the view that training should not be restricted to youth or necessarily to the poor.

"Job training should be provided for everyone seeking employment and tailored for job needs."

"Low income youth should have the same thing available to them as any other group."

"But not just for low income. Courses at Community College--job related."

"Anything that would help low income youth get ahead. Many times they need a boost."

"Teach youth skills so that they can compete on an equal basis with each other."

"All youth need job training. This is not an income problem. Career education should be part of their high school orientation."

"Some form of vocational training and social training so they'd have an equal chance with those they compete with."

"Should be entitled to a good start; chance to learn skills and the ropes of working and getting a job."

Government training programs:

"More state programs."

"Programs like CETA should be created for youth."

"Government programs such as OIC."

"State and federal programs; technical, motivational, and educational."

"Government programs set up so that they can get the training that is required."

Several do refer to incentives for employers who provide training services.

> "Vocational training and employer tax credits."

Those respondents opposing job enhancement programs for low income youth were less inclined to share their reasons with interviewers. The comments they do provide, however, can be placed within four categories: a) statements emphasizing the value of self help as opposed to help from others; b) statements noting that employers (private sector) should be responsible for job training as opposed to governmental sponsorship; c) statements indicating that schools should have responsibility for youth training and that schools as well as other local institutions are doing their job; and d) statements taking exception to the iedea of restricting job training to any one age, race, or economic group.

A. Self Help

> "Opportunities for employment are there. They must have incentives, desire, and motivation to seek work."
>
> "Everyone should have own initiative."
>
> "Not just for the poor--if they really want to, they'll find a job. So many young people just don't want to work."
>
> "Should abolish about 99% of programs and just let kids get out and work. They take too much advantage of federal programs--just sit back and expect money and not have to work for it."
>
> "They appreciated a job more and will stay on the job longer."
>
> "You have to start at the bottom and work your way up in anything you do."
>
> "Kids need a good attitude out of themselves in order to get a job. Don't feel extra assistance is necessary."
>
> "No, feel they should be on their own."
>
> "They should receive training on their own."
>
> "Must pull themselves up by their own boot straps."

B. The Employers Responsibility

"Employers should train employees."

"We train all of our employees. Some youth may have to work at employment training a little longer. A job in industry is a better way of employing youths."

"Prefer to train them in our own techniques."

"We train them ourselves."

"The organization sponsors on-the-job training to prepare the youth for a job."

C. The Schools Responsibility

"More emphasis should be given to improve education while youth are in school."

"Schools should be responsible for providing such services."

"We do a lot of work on COE, etc. in school. Every student is exposed to how to fill out job applications, go through a job interview, etc."

"Schooling should prepare youths for the market place."

"Enough already at high school."

D. Unrestricted Training

"All income levels should have a shot at job training to help them get jobs."

"They are willing to give a chance and training to any well motivated person.

"Should be available for youth of all income levels; general training."

Who Should Provide Employment Training?

Employer respondents are very much interested in the issue of who should play the primary role in job training and placement of unemployed youth. With few exceptions each respondent did express some opinion or attitude. About half of the respondents select the government (at all levels) as the major agent for the organization and implementation of youth employment enhancing activity. The other half of the respondents are almost equally divided between those who feel the task should be with the private sector and those who endorse a more collaborative effort between the private and public sectors.

The comments made by respondents, however, more than suggests that a majority were not comfortable with being "forced" to make a choice between the private and public sector. We say "forced" since the question asked included only two options (Public Sector or Private Sector) and did not include any other alternative response. It is from the comments of respondents that we were able to determine that at least a fourth clearly preferred some combination of public and private effort in the matter of youth employment training. An analysis of expressed opinions and attitudes also indicates that even among those who did choose one or other of the available options (public vs private), there are many who would wish to see a viable partnership between government and the private sector.

Prior to the presentation of a sampling of respondent expression, it should be noted that while there is no significant differences in how employers of the eight different industrial organizations respond to this question--there are variations. At the same time, differences between employers of program youth and those who hired control group are minimal.

Those who believe that training and placement services for unemployed youth is the responsibility of the public sector frequently comment that these services are social or public responsibilities. "It is a function of society," commented one person. Respondents qualify their comments by indicating why they believe these services are the responsibility of the government.

> "Government should have the responsibility to provide its people with basic training regardless of their income status."

"It is a public problem and it could be better controlled and monitored than if left to the private sector."

"It's the government's function to train skills deficient in youth."

"The government should provide these services."

"The government has participated in depriving youth of basic skills and it is their responsibility to remediate."

"Government should set up more programs that will benefit youths looking for jobs."

"It is the government's job to try to set up programs to benefit unemployed youth."

"This is more in line with what they do."

"There are federal, state, and city funds that can probably be used for this purpose."

"If it provided [it is the] public's responsibility to do so."

Respondents also point out that the public sector is better equipped to launch training and placement services for unemployed youth. The public sector is seen as having the resources necessary to provide these services.

"They have the resources to develop and operate training centers."

"Government can afford it."

"The scale is too grand for private business to provide what's needed to the underprivileged."

"They [public sector] should have more facilities and finances."

"[The public sector is the] only sector with funds and facilities available to provide this training and placement in a uniform manner for all interested youth."

"More agencies to provide job opportunities."

"Because they have the funds to do it."

"More work force and time to do this type of service."

"They have the means and capability to do the job."

"The government would be able to properly fund the programs."

Also mentioned frequently by respondents who believe the public sector should provide training services is the public education system. These respondents call for the public schools to institute training programs to meet the needs of youth who will enter the work world.

> "Public schools should be the base for job training."
>
> "It should be provided within the school system."
>
> "All training would work better if they started from high school years."
>
> "It should be handled in the public schools."
>
> "Improve upon already existing public education to meet [these needs]."
>
> "Should happen in high school because they still have a chance to be employable after graduation."
>
> "Educational institutions already established. Just include more job training in various areas."
>
> "Schools in position to prepare for life should mix academics with the realities of working."
>
> "If it starts in the schools, it will improve the character of the kids when they get out there."
>
> "Training should be provided by the school systems."

Some respondents state that, if left to the private sector, job training services would not be readily available. They point out that the private sector does not possess the necessary resources to implement and sustain large scale training and placement efforts. Still others hold the position that the private sector is not really interested in taking on such a massive venture.

> "Private sector does not care."
>
> "Cannot depend on the private sector."
>
> "Private will only train their children."
>
> "If private sector does, they will not put out the money for job training."
>
> "Private won't take expense and trouble to do it."
>
> "Private sector is in the business to make money. They cannot take on the job of training even though it has an obligation to the community."

> "Would rather have private, but don't think they will offer training equally to everyone."

> "Private industry won't go to the degree needed to do this."

> "I am in the private sector and cannot afford to do job training on a mass scale; however, the larger businesses should."

> "Many in the private [sector] do not have the skills or the money to do so."

Still other respondents note that they pay taxes and see training and placement service legitimate expenditures of their tax dollars.

> "Public because of all the employer tax dollars."

> "Because that's what we pay taxes for."

> "Taxes should go to help youth which finally helps everyone."

A few who commented on the payment of taxes indicated that if the government were to provide tax incentives, the private sector would then be able to deliver training and placement services. Others do not mention taxes specifically, but note that incentives are necessary if the private sector is to contribute to a national effort.

> "Private sector, if the taxes weren't already so high."

> "Unless the private sector contributors receive some kind of government releif."

A few mention that the public sector should be in charge of training and placement services because of their [public sector] control of the economy.

> "I believe it would help the economy if more programs were set up to help youth acquire jobs."

> "Because they have control over what goes on in the economy."

More than a few respondents who chose the "public sector" option comment that a partnership between both sectors was necessary to provide necessary youth services.

"I would like to see the responsibility shared, but the government has the money to do the job."

"It should begin here [public sector] and disseminated into the private sector."

"Both should be responsible, not just one."

Many of the respondents who select the "private sector" option make the point that it is the private sector which provides most jobs. Because the private sector is seen by these respondents as the sector providing major employment opportunities, it is considered to be the best enterprise for the training and placement needs of youth. These respondents believe that the relationship between training and the work environment will be stronger when services are provided by the private sector.

"It is where most of the jobs are."

"Private sector can better address specific needs of their own than general public sector training."

"My reason being they would only have the single job of preparing youth for the world of work."

"Far more capable of offering a wide variety of skills in the actual work environment."

"Skills and work habits are not taught or emphasized enough in the public sector; private is primarily on-the-job training with all the job rules in force."

"They would be given more personal attention."

"Experience is better provided by private employers."

"On-the-job training--will learn faster and have better understanding of job."

"Private business can provide definite training."

"No point in it unless there is a job for them to go to. Find from past experience that youth from federally funded job training programs do not work out."

"Because they are the only ones who could hire."

"No need for government interference. Government trains in a vacuum and is a waste of time."

> "Due to knowledge of the type of qualifications [required] by the private sector."
>
> "The market place needs to establish, hire, and train what they need."

Other comments from those who opt for the private sector indicate that the private sector does (or would do) a better job of providing training and placement services to unemployed youth than does (or would) the public sector. Others add that the public sector has tried to provide these services, but has not been successful. Some who felt that the private sector would perform better say they could do so at less expense and bureaucratic confusion.

> "Better approach to anything. If the private [sector] can't accomplish it, I wouldn't expect public [sector] to."
>
> "Any jobs the public sector can do can be done at less cost by the private sector and at a profit."
>
> "Public sector has already been tried, and it is not working."
>
> "We can do a better job. We are more attuned to productivity. We are a profit-making organization."
>
> "Because of these incentives to make a profit."
>
> "Private sector does a better job. Youth are more apt to apply self to maintain job in work environment."
>
> "We train better than the public sector."
>
> "Better prepared to handle and train youth."
>
> "They would not tolerate poor performance.

There are also those who hold the view that private sector involvement will require an easing of governmental regulations and more in the way of incentives.

> "Private sector can handle this area of training if they had more incentive such as lower wages."
>
> "With proper incentives--Targeted Job Tax Credits or private sector tax rebate for hiring youth. Private sector knows what skills are needed. Government doesn't."
>
> "Should reduce taxes so private industry can create more jobs."

A handful hold the view that government is already over-extended and expected to do too much.

> "I don't feel that the government can afford to offer training for unemployed youth."
>
> "Too much is expected of government."
>
> "Private needs to get involved--public only so much they can do."
>
> "Because there should be greater responsibility on the part of private business."

A few emphasize the waste that comes with governmental involvement in the delivery of services, as well as the added burden placed on taxpayers.

> "Public funding or assistance could be a big waste of money; lots of kids don't care to work."
>
> "Because all won't use or need training services, so all should not pay."
>
> "Better for country in the long run; government programs pull up taxes with burden on middle income people."
>
> "Taxpayers are paying enough."

Several believe that the private sector as part of its social responsibility should take on job training efforts.

> "They gain economically from the public by sales of products and feel they should refund the public in terms of employment."
>
> "Business should be more involved. Companies should participate in community activities."
>
> "Because it [private sector] benefits so much from the community."

As stated earlier, no matter the option selected, many respondents do see the task of providing employment related training as well as job placement as a responsibility of both government and the private sector. Some qualify their comments by indicating an equal sharing by the two sectors, but most simply talk about the appropriateness of a national collaborative undertaking. Sample responses of those who marked both options are:

"Both private and public should contribute in providing quality training for unemployed youth."

"Both--seems like one sector shouldn't be burdened with the entire thing."

"Has to be a cooperative effort. One can't handle it alone."

"I feel that in order to decrease unemployment both need to provide them services."

"The burden falls equally to both areas."

"Both should share equally. They both have the money to do it, but would rather spend it on something else."

"Both to provide equal opportunity."

"It's the responsibility of both. Both have an important role and one can't do without the other."

"Both benefit from increased productivity and produce better citizens."

CHAPTER VII: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

As we noted in the introduction of this report, our concern here is with the attitudes, perceptions, and experiences of employers of low income youth. More specifically, youth between the ages of 16 and 21 who had participated in the federally funded programs under the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) of August, 1977.

As also noted earlier, this report should be viewed as a companion piece to a series of research reports, prepared by E.T.S., dealing with the experiences, attitudes, and perceptions of program participants. These two research inquiries are meant to provide insights into both sides of the employment coin--from the perspective of the employee as well as that of the employer.

Not unlike other larger scale national surveys, particularly those relying upon interviewers, this study is not without certain sampling and data collecting flaws. The problems are not major, but they are worth noting. We would have, for example, been more comfortable had we obtained a sizable number of employer respondents from each of the eight industrial categories. Certainly, it would have been beneficial had there been a larger sample of respondents in the CONS and FFF organizations. The respondent size of each industrial grouping, however, was determined by the number of program participants and controls reported to have been employed within a particular industrial organization.

There were also cases, we believe, where interviews may have been conducted with an inappropriate respondent. That is, an individual who was not responsible for the screening and hiring of youthful employees.

Finally, there were instances where interviewers failed to obtain information requested in the survey instrument. Again, however, we do not believe that these shortcomings are sufficient to seriously detract from the quality or credibility of the findings.

As reported in Chapter II of this volume, the largest single employing organization of program participants and control group youth was the Service and Select Retail Trades (SSRT). Health, Education, Welfare, Governmental Services, and Religious (HEWG) agencies make up the second largest group. These are primarily non-profit, public service agencies. The two service categories, Wholesale-Retail Trade (WRT) and Service and Select Retail Trade (SSRT) accounted for the employment of about half of all the youth followed in this survey. The smallest samples of youth employees were located in Construction (CONS) and Farming, Fisheries, and Forestry (FFF).

With the slight exception of HEWG organizations, differences between participant and control job placements were minimal. The largest proportion of YEDPA youth were in the SSRT and HEWG areas, while controls tended to be more evenly distributed among three work settings: SSRT, HEWG, and WRT.

A variety of variables are associated with observed differences in where participants found employment. Operators of programs and program sites no doubt varied in their access to entry level job opportunities and the role they played in connecting participants with potential employers. The National Council of Women, for example, had the largest percentage of employed participants in HEWG organizations (41%), while La Raza reported the lowest percentage of HEWG employment (18%). La Raza, on the other hand, was most successful in MANU placements (26%). Private Sector Initiatives report four out of ten placements in SSRT (40%) as compared to the National Urban League's (13%). The National Urban League, however, does report a higher rate of employment in WRT organizations (33%) than all other program operators.

While most jobs obtained by youth were in the private sector, almost a fifth (17%) found work in public organizations. Both the National Urban League and Recruitment Training Program report a twenty-two percent (22%) placement in the public sector as contrasted with Job Factory where only four percent (4%) of participants were employed in public agencies.

Sizeable differences are found when comparisons are made between race/ethnicity, sex, and organizational work setting. Black youth are more likely than either hispanic or white youth to be employed in HEWG organizations; blacks are less likely to be employed in MANU; and white youth show the highest employment in WRT. A particularly large percentage of white males are in WRT compared to black and hispanic males who tend to be concentrated in SSRT and MANU. The greatest variation between groups is found in HEWG organizations where black females show an employment rate twenty-six percent (26%) greater than white males.

Age and educational status were also found to be significant factors in accounting for differences in where youth found employment.

Upon examining the racial/ethnic composition of the total work force of all organizations represented in this study, we found that more than half of the employees are white, a little more than a quarter are black, and less than a fifth are hispanic or of some other ethnic heritage. Whites tend to be over-represented in the Financial, Insurance and Select Business Services (FINS) and in Manufacturing (MANU). Blacks are over-represented in HEWG employment, and hispanics are over-represented in FFF and MANU.

As might be anticipated, we find that the largest proportion of younger youth (ages 16-18) are employed in the SSRT organizations--those companies with the highest turnover rates among young entry level workers. Similarly, the data indicate that the lowest average hourly wages are paid by those organizations which do employ the largest proportion of entry level youth.

Data dealing with entitlements and benefits show that more than half of the employers report that their companies offer full time employees at least the following:

Paid Vacations
Paid Holidays
Hospital/Medical Benefits
Paid Sick Leave
Life Insurance

Since the majority of companies require some mandatory period of employment prior to employee access to these benefits, it is doubtful that most entry level youth actually participate in these company offerings. Further, the information provided by employers makes clear that the most comprehensive and attractive benefit packages are found precisely in those organizations which employ the smallest number of young workers.

Finally, we find that counseling services for employees tend to be found in organizations where there is less in the way of employee turnover and more in the way of work force continuity.

From Chapter III we are able to gain some insights as to the barriers which youth, particularly low income youth, may confront as they seek to make the school to work transition. The data show that every employing organization does insist upon entry level employees meeting some type of entrance criteria.

That finding in itself is not startling. What is of interest are the range of entrance demands of employers of youth entering the job market. Nine out of ten employers require evidence of qualification in at least four areas. Five of ten employers require that new workers meet at least seven entry qualifications. Further, the vast majority of respondents believe not only that these standards are desirable, but that there should be greater enforcement of these entry level qualifications.

Interestingly, as many employers note the importance of "personal appearance" as "ability to read," and "ability to write." Far more emphasis is placed upon cognitive skills and personal grooming than upon "work experience," "high school diploma," or "previous job training."

While there is a high level of consensus among all employers for these entrance qualifications, there are variations between organizations. Briefly, those employing the largest proportion of younger adolescents tend to be less demanding in entrance qualifications. The findings are reflective of a system which operates efficiently in absorbing new young workers into those jobs which are viewed as being most appropriate for young, first time, entry level novices. The employment gates are opened most widely to the unskilled, uninitiated, and inexperienced for entry into those jobs which demand the least in the way of skill, experience, or commitment.

Still, the question which must be raised is "Why so much for so little?" That is, given the demands of these entry level jobs, why the insistence upon so many entrance qualifications? What is the relationship between these qualifications and the demands of the job? Further, what evidence is there that youth who meet some or all of these qualifications are more productive or reliable employees?

The role and saliency of entrance qualifications becomes even less clear when we note that only a small number of employers utilize written tests, oral tests, or performance tests in sorting out acceptable and unacceptable candidates. How employers can assess cognitive skill qualifications without such tests remains a mystery. We might speculate that there are some serious discrepancies between qualifications cited and qualifications enforced.

As there are entrance qualifications, there are also behaviors and conditions which may act to keep young people out of the work force. Disqualification factors of employing organizations cover a wide range of behaviors and personal attributes. Almost half of the employers state that a record of drug use would disqualify a young person for employment. A third would deny employment because of a prison record; a fourth for an arrest; limited English ability, or physical handicaps.

Employers do then, establish qualifications for job entry and a significant number, though not a majority, will disqualify applicants who fail to meet certain behavioral, social, and physical criteria.

We find that age is a very important factor in controlling the kinds of jobs which will be available to young people. Further, we found that although the very large majority of employers do insist upon evidence of cognitive skills--reading, writing, and arithmetic--only a handful actually use some type of test or instrument in order to assess the applicant's ability to meet qualifying standards. Most employers appear to rely upon personal interviews and prior job references as the data used to screen out desirable and undesirable candidates. The findings from this portion of our investigation would suggest there may not necessarily be a rational fit between the skills required by the entrance level jobs youth obtain and the qualifications-disqualifications used by employers. Further, these data suggest that factors, other than those identified in this research, may be playing a role in hiring decisions.

Again, the information from this study cannot provide answers to questions of racial, sexual, or ethnic discrimination. The discrepancies, however, between expressed qualifications and lack of means to assess these qualifications, and the lack of fit between job requirements and expressed qualifications-disqualifications, does contribute to the impression that discrimination is an operating factor in the employment process. Both sides, employee and employer, enter the hiring process with little in the way of meaningful exchange data. The youthful candidate does not possess hard evidence of competencies, attitude, or motivation. Employers, on the other hand, seem to be without measures, benchmarks, or standards with which they might more effectively and more judiciously assess youthful job candidates.

Finally, these analysis suggest that there would be merit in a closer working relationship between those who employ youth and those involved in the education and career related training of youth. Such a collaboration might help in maximizing the goodness of fit in the school to work transition.

In Chapter IV we dealt with the employers' experiences with and assessments of young employees. There is much in the way of consensus among respondents as to the areas in which youth are in need of work preparation. Cited most frequently is an improvement in work related attitudes. A more positive work attitude as well a greater "knowledge of proper behavior on the job" are noted far more frequently than are needs for improvement in job skills or technical education.

Employers feel that youth lack an appropriate work ethic and that they are also very much in need of basic educational skills: reading, writing, and arithmetic.

According to our respondents, job turnover among youth is far more likely to be the result of action taken by the young employee rather than the employer. Eight of ten respondents say that voluntary termination is the major source of employment turnover among youth. Being fired or being laid off accounts for only a fifth of the job terminations. The major reason given for the high level of voluntary job departure on the part of the young is that they have found and accepted a better job. Still, almost half of the respondents say that a combination of a lack of interest in the current job and personal reasons (i.e. family, childbirth, delinquency) are strong contributing factors to the relatively high job mobility of youth.

Absenteeism and unacceptable attitude or behavior are the main reasons why youth are terminated by their employers. Clearly, the data provided by respondents points to perceived deficiencies in attitude and behavior as the most salient problem factors. Failure to possess necessary job or technical skills are rarely mentioned. As we point out in Chapter IV. these findings should not be surprising since the bulk of entry level jobs taken by the young require minimal competencies. Employers then look for young workers who will be dependable, presentable, and fairly well-behaved--characteristics and attributes which are not, according to employer respondents, prevalent among contemporary youth.

Interestingly, despite the problems encountered, these same respondents tend to hold a fairly sympathetic and understanding attitude toward these same young employees. Respondents make two major points: 1. Many of the jobs held by youth are not the kind that would enhance a strong commitment to task or employer, 2. predictability and responsibility are attributes which come with maturity and are rarely to be practiced by adolescents. Further, the perception of a lack of appropriate work values and behaviors is a more prevalent a problem among the young, it is not restricted to youth. On the contrary, respondents feel that many older, more mature employees are also lacking in appropriate work motivation, loyalty, and responsibility.

Noted also in Chapter IV are data indicating that the majority of program and control group youth are satisfied with the work they are doing; believe that they get a fair pay for the work they do; feel that they are doing worthwhile work; and given current knowledge of their job, they would take the same job again.

What is also clear from the evidence provided by these youth is the fact that while they are content with their current entry level job, very few expect to continue to work for the same organization in the near future. Less than a third feel that, given a choice, they would choose to remain with the same employer five years hence.

The fact that employers do anticipate high job turnover among youth and that they do recognize that dependability is not a prevalent characteristic of American youth does not make the task of screening, training, and scheduling youthful employees any easier. Obviously, employers would prefer that youthful employees exhibit more in the way of loyalty, gratitude, and responsibility--attributes not too dissimilar from those they would wish to see in all their employees. Meanwhile, those who do employ large numbers of youth will continue to anticipate more of the same kind of job related problems and will do the best they can to minimize the dysfunctions caused by the highly mobile and kinetic behavior of youth.

In Chapter V we examined a number of attitudinal areas dealing with how respondents compare older and younger workers. We also point out that the explanatory comments offered by respondents add a very important dimension to our understanding of not only what employers believe, but also why they hold the views they do.

There are four work related comparisons in which employers hold fairly similar views toward older and younger workers. Generally, as many agree, disagree, or feel there are no differences between the generations in ability to communicate; opportunities for promotion; and on-the-job initiative. Nor do they believe that one age group is more or less a risk to employers than is the other.

Argument among employer respondents is greatest when questions of adherence to work schedules and adaptability are raised. Clearly, respondents see younger workers as less reliable in matters of promptness and work attendance and older workers less adaptable in dealing with new problems.

The two questions which generate the most in the way of disagreement are:

> "Older workers have worse attendance records than younger ones." and
> "Younger workers keep their job longer than older workers."

Again, a theme which is prevalent whenever employers discuss young, entry level employees is that younger workers are viewed as unpredictable and highly mobile.

While less dramatic in emphasis, employers are also inclined to disagree that older workers are less efficient than younger workers. The majority do not believe that younger workers should have an advantage over older workers in either hiring or on-the-job practices. Nor do they feel that they would prefer to employ older rather than younger workers.

Ability to get along with ones co-workers is viewed as an attribute shared equally by both older and younger workers. Similarly, respondents see older and younger workers fairly much the same in performance evaluations made by supervisors and in the quality of the work performed.

Although we do find some instances where there seems to be a relationship between age composition of the organizational work force and age-based evaluations, the pattern is not consistent.

What we find from these reponses and comments is a profile of the younger worker as someone not unlike older co-workers, with several strong exceptions. The younger worker is considered to be less reliable in showing up for work and frequently as someone who will not show up on time. Further, he or she is an individual who frequently changes jobs, and when at work may be less efficient in the use of time than more mature employees.

Perceived differences are far less pronounced in matters of communicating and getting along with co-workers; quality of work performed; adaptability to problems; and assessments made by work supervisors.

Finally, employers are not inclined to prefer older to younger workers nor do they believe that age should be primary criteria in hiring and work policies.

In Chapter VI attention was given to both the respondent awareness of YEDPA programs as well as attitudes pertaining to a number of important policy matters.

A little more than half of the respondents report that their firms have employed youth employment program participants. A smaller number, some 30% are not certain if they are employers of such youth, and the remainder respond that such hirings have not occurred. Employers identified as having employed program participants are more likely, although the difference is not significant, than control group employers to report an affirmative hiring response.

Whether employers are or are not aware of having employed youth who are products of federal training programs does not appear to be associated with awareness of local YEDPA programs or evaluation of the quality of employment training programs. The majority of employer respondents are not familiar with local YEDPA organizations, but the majority believe such programs have been successful in enhancing employment opportunities for low income youth.

There is also a fair degree of consensus among employers as to the following policy issues:

I. Job training/job assistance should be provided for low income youth. Many respondents believe such programs should be available for youth as well as adults, no matter economic status of the potential client.

II. Preferential treatment of minority youth should not be advocated in either policy or program.

III. Minority youth are not perceived as being more or less of a risk or problem in the workplace than non-minority youth. The education and socio-economic status of youth are considered to be more important variables.

IV. There should not be a differential minimum wage for youth.

V. A differential wage scale would not lead to greater employment of youth.

VI. Responsibility for the provision of job training and placement for unemployed youth should rest primarily with the public sector in collaboration with private enterprise.